

THEOLOGY

A Monthly Journal of Historic Christianity

Edited by Canon E. G. SELWYN, D.D., REDHILL RECTORY, ROWLANDS CASTLE,
HANTS, to whom all editorial matters should be addressed.

Vol. XXI

OCTOBER, 1930

No. 124

EDITORIAL

EUCHARISTICA

WE publish three articles this month which in different ways may serve as contributions to the discussions on Eucharistic doctrine now taking place in the Church of England. Dr. Gavin's article, which will be concluded in our next issue, is the work of one of the most learned scholars of our generation in Rabbinic and liturgical studies—a combination of studies, we may add, which is of vital importance to the understanding of Eucharistic origins; and the materials afforded by his article are indispensable to any form of Eucharistic doctrine which is to be based upon truth rather than expediency. If, as we understand is the case, the Conferences on Eucharistic doctrine held last spring at King's College under the presidency of the Archbishop of York are to be resumed this autumn, Dr. Gavin's paper is obviously germane to their purpose. The same may be said of two books published this year, which will be reviewed in *THEOLOGY* in the near future. One is the Bishop of Gibraltar's *The Fulness of Sacrifice*, which makes it abundantly clear that the doctrine of the Real Presence cannot be studied in isolation from its context in that of the Eucharistic Sacrifice; the other is Dr. Macdonald's *Berengar*, an ably written historical monograph, which reminds us that what may be called the Evangelical doctrine of the Eucharist has a much more ancient and respectable pedigree than is commonly supposed.

Canon Knight's article is addressed more directly to the purposes of the King's College Conferences; and, if the production of a formula of concord is *per se* desirable, we think that his suggestions may prove of considerable value. A formula built around the idea of "Transvaluation," more particularly if it made use of the terms used in the definition of the Council of Bethlehem, would undoubtedly rally a very large volume

of support, not least on the Catholic side. Our chief doubt about it is as to how far it would secure support among Evangelicals. Dr. Macdonald, for instance, expresses frequent objection in his book to any doctrines which involve what he calls "metabolism." Considering what such doctrines often meant, or at least covered, in the eleventh century in the way of gross materialism and superstition, he may well claim sympathy in this; but a justifiable reaction against error is seldom an adequate foundation for positive doctrine, though it is often its actual occasion. Under Dr. Macdonald's lead, we may be fairly sure that Evangelical doctrine will tend more and more to lay stress on the element of symbolism in the Eucharist. Criticism of this position will not take the line that it is erroneous, but that it stops short at a point where the analysis could and should be carried further. And the possibility of securing an adequate formula of concord will depend on whether Evangelicals are prepared to take that further step.

Those who repose great hopes upon such an issue to the King's College Conferences will naturally be disappointed if it is not forthcoming; but for our own part we are bound to say that an unsatisfactory formula of concord would be far worse than none at all. It may fairly be argued—and this seems to us one of the chief lessons of Berengar's life—that the greatest of all objections to the dogma of Transubstantiation was not that it defined erroneously but that it defined at all; and that certainly seems to be what Hildebrand thought, when the issue was raised in his own day. That there should be two schools of Eucharistic theology in the Church of England at the same time seems to us to be in no sense a regrettable thing, provided that they are really schools of theology and not of ecclesiastical partisanship. Each will have differences of ceremonial expression and devotional usage: Mr. Mace's article printed below indicates one direction in which authorized liberty will continue to be claimed on the Catholic side. But provided that one rite is followed at all the common services of the Church, and especially at the Holy Communion, we do not see why charity should be impaired. And where charity is, the truth will sooner or later be apprehended.

We are glad to print Mr. Mace's article, though on one point we are not in agreement with it: that is to say, we believe that there are real theological objections to Benediction which do not apply to Devotions. On the other hand, we agree with him in desiring to see Devotions authorized and regulated in

the Church of England. The experience of their devotional value is too widespread, and is voiced by men whose work for Christ is too obviously blest, to be set aside. The position is one of great practical difficulty, as Mr. Mace fully realizes; and there is every reason for following the maxim, *Festina lente*. But we are not without hope that a spirit may grow throughout the Church which will enable these matters to be considered quietly and with forbearance. Perhaps not the least debt that we may owe to Dr. Relton and those who have worked with him for Eucharistic unity is that the King's College Conferences, even if they do not immediately achieve a formula, will have done very much to foster a right spirit.

THE CATHOLIC IDEA OF THE EUCHARIST IN THE FIRST FOUR CENTURIES (I)*

I ATTEMPT herewith to set down, in some sort of orderly sequence, the course of the development of the Catholic view and Catholic usages as to the Eucharist. As the material touched upon will abundantly illustrate, it is not strictly chronological; the New Testament is presented, illustrated from its Jewish background, and set as the first formulation of the Christian Tradition in series with certain other selected examples of that Tradition, roughly terminating in the fourth century. Of secondary texts Lietzmann's *Messe und Herrenmahl* (Bonn, 1926) has been extensively drawn upon, and his influence will be everywhere apparent, even where I differ from him. Much of the early material—particularly the Rabbinic—is collected from my own studies in this field. For the N.T. I am drawing in part upon the wisdom of my colleague, the Rev. Professor Easton.

THE NEW TESTAMENT

I

Of specific texts in the Gospels must be noticed not only the accounts of the Institution—commonly called “The Last Supper”—but the accounts of the Miraculous Feedings as well. We shall mention, first, the narratives of the latter type. These are: (a) the Feeding of the Five Thousand, Mark vi. 38-44, with parallels in Matt. xiv. 17-21 and Luke ix. 13-17 (cf. John vi. 1-13); (b) the Feeding of the Four Thousand, Mark viii. 1-10 (and Matt. xv. 32-39). To be specially observed at this point are the interesting Rabbinic parallels, particularly to Mark vi. 39-41, which may be most conveniently consulted in Strack-Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum N.T. aus Talmud und Midrasch erlautert*. These parallels refer to the words *συμπόσια* and *πρασιαί*, the sequence *λαβών, εὐλόγησεν, κατέκλασεν, κ.τ.λ.* The procedure is that of a Jewish host “saying grace,” and of Rabbinic assemblies in solemn conclave. The second observation is that the language of the triple account is, as well, liturgical and quasi-Eucharistic: “Taking . . . bread . . . He gave thanks and brake . . . and gave to the disciples to distribute to them, and the two fishes he divided to all” (Mark. vi. 41). The impress of liturgical usage is patent, and the likeness to the account of the Last Supper unmistakable.

* A paper prepared for the Theological Committee to the Commission of the Episcopal Church of America on Faith and Order.

Turning to these narratives we possess, so far as concerns the alleged origin of the Eucharistic rite in the N.T., four accounts: (1) St. Paul's in 1 Cor. xi. 23-25; (2) the Matthæan-Markan (Matt. xxvi. 26-29, and Mark xiv. 22-25); (3) the Lukan (xxii. 15-20); and (4) the Johannine (chap. vi.). (With these must be compared Luke xxiv. 30-35, and Acts ii. 42, 46; xx. 7, 11; xxvii. 35 [?].)

Taking (2) first: the variations of Matt. from Mark are slight but significant—the name Jesus is inserted (xxvi. 26); *φάγετε* is inserted (26); Matt. reads “drink ye all,” while Mark, “they all drank of it” (injunction instead of narrative); *εἰς ἀφεστιν ἀμαρτιῶν* is added (28); *μεθ' ὑμῶν* is inserted in 29. The changes are slight emendations, additions, or the like, made largely in the interests of liturgical smoothness. There are three clauses in this account (Matt.-Mark): with reference to the bread, to the wine, and the eschatological reference (Matt. xxvi. 29-Mark xiv. 25). The time of the Institution is: “as they were eating.” The allusions are to Exod. xxiv. 8; Jer. xxxi. 31; and Zach. ix. 11. This material on the best recent critical ground is held to be Palestinian and pre-Pauline, representing an ecclesiastical tradition independent alike of St. Paul and of the Lukan statement.

(1) The first account, the Pauline narrative,* is chiefly different for the following: the words over the bread occur apparently *during* the supper, the words over the cup *after* (1 Cor. xi. 23b, 26; the order is the same as in Matt.-Mark);† there is added: *τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν*, “my Blood of the Covenant shed for many” has become “the new Covenant in my Blood”; the omission of the third, the eschatological, clause.

(3) The Lukan passage constitutes a complex textual problem. The present received text gives us a cup (xxii. 17), substantially the third (eschatological) clause of the Matt.-Mark tradition, the institution of the bread, and of a second cup. It is supported by the uncials (except Beza), a number of minuscules, the Old Latin MSS. (Colbertinus, Brixianus, Monacensis, the Usher codices, the Stockholm Vulgate), and certain families of secondary versions (Bohairic, Sahidic, Armenian, and Ethiopic). The Peshitto omits vers. 17-18, simplifying its Lukan tradition by correspondence with the other two Synoptics, save for the third clause. The Western text, of Cod Beza, the Old Latin (in C. Vercelliensis; a conflated Vulgate, Old Latin represented by the Rehdiger MS. at Breslau;

* Probably due to rejection of the Lukan tradition, on which see below.

† However, the reference in 1 Cor. x. 16 suggests a different order—“cup of blessing,” “bread which we break.”

the Paris Corbeiensis, Vindobonensis, etc.) omit (ver. 19b): "given for you" through ver. 20, and offer a connected reading with the institution of the cup first, then of the bread. Tatian omitted 19b ("given for you"), transposing "Do this" to the end of ver. 20. The Old Latin in the Verona and Palatine MSS. together with the Curetonian Syriac give the verses (with variants that we can pass over) in the following order: 19 (b omitted by the Old Latin), 17, 18, omitting 20. The Sinaitic Syriac has 19, 20a, 17, 20b, and 18. It is difficult to feel that the present received text can be primitive, and the more probable original of the Lukan text would seem to have been one lacking ver. 20—in other words, recording a tradition in which only the institution of the bread was central. Despite Burkitt's hypothesis (*JTS*, ix. [1908], pp. 569-572), accepted by Lagrange and others, that 15-16 shows unmistakable originality and thus independence of Mark (Matt.), it would seem more likely that this section (vers. 15-16) rests on Mark, selected and adapted, and that the primitively Lukan kernel is precisely what, for example, the Peshitto omits entirely. The double source of alteration is assimilation to Mark and the influence of the Pauline tradition, which has issued in the standard (Alexandrine) received text. One further witness (outside the N.T., however) may shed light on the non-fixity of the Lukan text—Justin M., 1 *Apol.* lxvi. 3, where "This do unto my memorial" precedes the words "This is my Body." At all events, the Lukan current text is that of the Great Church, the authority of which corporate consensus validated the reading.

An irreducible minimum of the Synoptic account yields: blessing over the bread and the words, "This is my body," and of the wine, with the words, "This is my blood" (lacking probably in original Luke). It is important to realize the vast significance of the words, "This is my body . . . my blood." A critical examination of the genuine *logia* of our Lord demonstrates no other *certain* allusion* to the Passion as an act of self- and freely-willed sacrifice. It would not be too much to say that only in these words of the Eucharistic Institution do we possess indubitable evidence that the Passion and Death of our Lord were regarded by Him as freely willed, as potently efficacious, and as achieving Atonement. It is these words which furnish a justifying point of departure for the Apostolic and subsequent evaluation of the Passion as uniquely significant and basically fundamental as an essential fact in the dispensation of the Incarnation. The events of Calvary, in the light of the Institution, became a sacrifice—not

* The only allegedly genuine *logion* otherwise available is Mark x. 45 and the Matthæan parallel (xx. 28). Critically difficult to justify, it is still congruent with the Dominical teaching, and need not therefore be rejected in substance.

only a martyrdom, or a vicarious offering, or an execution. One of the essential notes of sacrifice is oblation: *the element of oblation on Good Friday is effected at the Institution on Thursday night.* We have then—waiving the matter of the (probably Pauline) command: “Do this”—in the indubitable critically justified kernel of the Eucharistic Institution precisely that which converts in advance the death of our Lord into a sacrifice. Whatever else any Eucharist anywhere should or could mean, this profound fact can never be overlooked; it is as in some intrinsic way connected with sacrifice that the Eucharist has its prime significance; “Body” and “Blood” “given” and “shed” cannot have signified less. The unanimity of the practice of early Christianity attests and reinforces this abundantly. The original core of the Eucharistic tradition lay heart to heart with the Sacrifice of Calvary, and the “sacrificial” element in the Eucharistic celebrations, being inherent and essential, were not engrafted from without.

The Pauline understanding of the Eucharist in 1 Cor. x. bears directly upon this, for the “spiritual food” and “drink” of x. 3-4 are but prototypes of the Eucharistic food and drink—fellowship in and partaking of the Blood and Body of the Christ (x. 16), Who is Himself now essentially “Spirit” (2 Cor. iii. 17). The Eucharist for St. Paul is *Spirit-infused Food*, hence the danger of its wrong use and the astounding potency it has for good and ill (cf. 1 Cor. xi. 26-31). The “showing forth of the Lord’s death” is obviously central to the Pauline thought, yet the spirit-infused food and drink are such because of the new level of the Lord Christ’s present life establishing a new relationship with His own.

The Johannine passage (chap. vi.) is, in the main, evidence of the same underlying evaluation of the Eucharistic bread and wine. On critical and scientific grounds it is impossible to eviscerate this chapter of its profoundly sacramental notions. The whole organization of the chapter as a literary composition is significant; it is introduced by two miracles (one-fourth of the whole yield of the fourth Gospel)—one, of the Miraculous Feeding, told in Eucharistic language (vi. 11), and the other, of the Walking on the Water, the point of which lies not only in the display of the Divine Power in Jesus’ subjecting nature to His control, but in the words: “They then were desiring to take Him into the boat and *immediately* the boat came to land” (vi. 21). It might be construed as the message of the Real Presence in power. The successive stages of unpalatable teaching in the Capernaum Synagogue culminate in vi. 54-56, of which the interpretation lies in the section, “The words I have spoken unto you they are Spirit and Life,” by which

we obtain the clue; it is the Spirit who alone makes the Eucharistic food potent to the end of its being "true food and drink" (vi. 55-56). It is precisely the same type of thought as in St. Paul: "spirit-infused" (*πνευματικόν*) or "heavenly" food.

As it is not vital to discuss the question, When did the fourth Evangelist place the Institution of the Eucharist? we may content ourselves with a remark or two. It would seem that in the Johannine account the Eucharist is associated with the Messianic Banquet-cycle of ideas, and that its Institution was understood to be connected either with the Miraculous Feedings or a post-Resurrection Meal (cf. xxi. 13). The bread and fish of this latter story hark back to the Miraculous Feeding of the Five Thousand in chap. vi., and to the similar Synoptic narratives. How are these related to the Eucharist? We have seen in the probable reading of the original Luke a Eucharist in one species (of bread), which is further substantiated by the other characteristically Lukan term (and narrative) "breaking of the bread" in Acts ii. 42, 46, and the Gospel (xxiv. 30, 35). Is there imbedded in the Evangelical narratives a twofold aspect and possibly double origin for the Eucharist—(a) the Banquet of the Heavenly Messiah, and also (b) the re-presentation of the Last Supper, the Commemoration of the Sacrifice? We operate, it is clear, with both cycles of ideas. To the former belong the Miraculous Feeding stories and most likely the Lukan tradition, possibly also the Johannine;* to the latter, the Matthæan-Markan pre-Pauline Palestinian tradition and the Pauline tradition itself. They are not clearly sundered, for, if the cycle of Passion-thoughts have disappeared from John, there still remains the Body and Blood terminology, coupled with a Christology which attaches to these terms an immensely powerful significance. Obviously, Body and Blood mean sacrifice, even if the point of view be not that of St. Paul. Both the fourth Evangelist and St. Paul arrived at the same evaluation of the Eucharist. To both the profound fact was of the surrender of the Life by one who was Lord and God. If St. Paul sees always the sacrifice of one who is Lord, St. John sees the Son of God who, by sacrificing Himself, gives His Body and Blood for the life eternal of His redeemed.

II

It is important for us now to turn aside to consider the antecedents of the ideas with which the narratives of the Feedings

* Yet the mention of "flesh" and "blood" in John vi. necessitates a retrospective reference in the Evangelist's mind to the Last Supper and Institution. For bread and wine of the Eucharist can only become spiritual food and drink by virtue of the fact that they are the Body and Blood of the Saviour.

and the stories of the Institution operate. We are throughout on thoroughly Jewish ground. Nothing is more impressive than the astounding yield of the Rabbinic sources for the interpretation of the cardinal rites of primitive Christianity—Baptism, the Agape, and the Eucharist. Our Lord was a Jew. The Apostles and disciples were Jews. The N.T. is to a large extent saturated with the Jewish environment in which it was written. There are certain cardinal matters concerning Jewish observances which it would be well to keep in mind: the *haburah* or Fellowship with a religious teacher (often the N.T. term *κοινωνία* translates this term and its connotations); the meal of the Fellowship on the eve of feast-days—the *Kiddush*; the *Birkath-ha-Mazon* or Grace at Meals in use at such times; the ideas and customs connected therewith. For the sake of brevity I must omit Rabbinic references, which are not difficult to obtain.

Jewish life was accustomed to the Fellowship organization, under a Rabbi or similar teacher, for religious and philanthropic purposes. The social and the sacred were not separated; religion and social observances went hand in hand. Such "fellowships" or *haburoth* would partake of a common meal on the eves of Feasts and Sabbaths, and the Rabbi or Master or Senior would preside. He said the *Birkath-ha-Mazon* or Grace. The rite then in use at any such meal involved a blessing of God for the bread, in the formula, "Blessed art thou, O Lord, King of the Universe, who dost bring forth bread from the ground," and of the wine, in the words: ". . . who dost create the fruit of the vine." The "Blessing" or *berakha* had become invariable; it must bless God for the thing in question; it must mention His Name (the word "Lord" was surrogate for the Ineffable and potent Name, the pronunciation of which was, during the first century, restricted to the High Priest on the Day of Atonement); it was deemed to release the food for human consumption, for without pronouncing a blessing no one ought to eat aught, for to do so would be theft from God, or sacrilege. Blessings in ancient days were conceived to release power, by invocation of the Divine Name, just as curses were effectual and potent releases of Divine power. Notice the ideas resident in the "blessing." The Hebrew בָּרְכָה becomes in Greek εὐλογία or εὐχαριστία—"praising" God, or "thank-ing" Him. Either term suffices. "To bless" = to thank God, or to pronounce Him "Blessed." The thing blessed is mentioned in relation to God. *It* is not blest; *He* is "blessed." The underlying thoughts are important.

After pronouncing the blessing over the bread, the leader of the group broke it, partook of it first himself, and then dis-

tributed it to those at table. Then—sometimes at the end of the meal—followed the blessing of the cup, done with a similar formula. This cup was the “cup of blessing,” i.e., that over which a blessing was recited. It forms part of the equipment of every Jewish household, and is used solemnly every Friday and the eves of feasts. (This whole, originally domestic, service was in the early Christian period transferred to the Synagogue as well, and survives in the Orthodox rite.) The formulas of blessing mentioned were to be officially spoken by the most dignified person present, and constitute the core of the Grace at Meals in the further responses of which the whole group shared, as well as in the Thanksgiving after the meal was eaten. So much is at present important if we are to understand the background as well of the Miraculous Feedings as of the Eucharistic Institution.

It is needless to point out, further, that the Messianic Feast idea—that the Lord Messiah will triumphantly entertain his own with a glorious banquet at which he is host—is thoroughly Jewish. (The heathen Sacred Meal, with its reference to Christianity, Völker has fully discussed in *Mysterium und Agape*, Gotha, 1927.) It is also not necessary to draw attention to the Jewish views of sacrifice current in our Lord’s time. That Old Testament passages—such as Exod. xxiv. 8, Jer. xxxi. 31, and Zach. ix. 11—were in our Lord’s mind when, adding to the usual Grace, He spoke the words of Institution, is obvious. There could be no covenant without blood-shedding which involves the surrender of life. This release of life is not only the means of the establishment of the Covenant, but of potent efficacy for the accomplishment of its fruits. Rabbinic speculation of the first century had come round to a practically sacramental view of the sacrifices; they were divinely ordained means to effect what they signified, but the obstructive or recalcitrant human will could preclude that effect. In short, the subjective factor had become clearly recognized; no sacrifice could forgive sin for the unrepentant (cf. G. F. Moore’s treatment, in *Judaism*). While there is no sacramental theorizing—to use admittedly question-begging terms!—on the part of the Rabbis, the sacramental outlook inherently maintains in Orthodox Judaism. No theoretic sundering of “outward and visible” from “inward and spiritual” distinguishes the radically unitive outlook of Rabbinism; “spirit” and “matter” might be contrasted, but they were not opposed, as in the Oriental dualism of the non-Jewish world. The rites of the observance of Judaism had back of them Divine authorization, and hence were potent and effective by reason of His Power and Will who was believed to have ordained them. Circumcision, the

proselytic baptismal admission to the Fellowship of Israel, the Passover, and above all, the Temple services, all these achieved their end, not by reason alone of the rigid and scrupulous fulfilment of the acts involved, but by virtue chiefly of the empowering will of God who was believed to have enjoined them. They might, in the case of the wrongly disposed individual, entirely fail of application and effective issue.

Only in the light of subsequent events—the Resurrection after the Crucifixion—did the vast significance of the triumphant issue of our Lord's Sacrifice come home to His followers. All His mysterious actions and words now were seen to be fundamentally important in the new orientation of Life which they gave. If *Acts* is to be trusted, the Christian Fellowship—the *haburah* of Jesus now declared to be more than Messiah—acted as a definite organic unit, with its own rites of initiation and comradeship, with its members and its Master. Paramount in certain quarters—Palestine and Pauline Christianity—was the memorial of the Passion in the Eucharistic celebration; another tradition fastened upon the vivid expectation of the Messianic triumph, anticipated by a potent and valid enactment, with His Presence, of the Messianic banquet. In either case, He was both present and, through His Spirit, was infusing the food and drink with what we cannot but call supernatural powers. His Spirit infused the whole Fellowship; His entrance into the individual (normally mediated by baptism, also by the laying-on of hands, and sometimes by immediate and unpredictable illapse into the believer) incorporated the believer into the Mystical Body of which He, the Spirit of Christ, was the soul. The Spirit came into the Eucharistic Food with abounding power for this life and that to come. Even, however, in those circles where the Messianic banquet cycle constituted the burning-centre of significance in the Eucharist, the sacrificial quality—at least in reminiscence—was not absent: “Body and Blood” “given and shed” kept it vitally alive. Also in the other Eucharistic type, “showing forth the Lord's death till He came,” the eschatological hope kept the Messianic-banquet idea also within the worshipper's consciousness.

We turn to the Pauline rite as described in 1 Cor. xi.:* the Blessing of the Bread, a meal, the Blessing of the Cup. We turn our attention to the middle member of these three. The Eucharist is separable from, but, as it were, comprises within it, a meal. Doubtless it is this which came by the later days, represented by Jude 12 (*εἰς τὰς ἀγάπας ὑμῶν*) and 2 Pet.

* No officiant is mentioned for it, by the way. Had there been any such duly appointed official, the disorders, the correction of which constitutes the occasion of the Pauline restatement of the tradition already given to the Corinthians, should easily have been taken care of.

ii. 13 (where the reading *ἀπάταις* obviously corrects the Jude material, lifted into 2 Pet. by the then much later church custom), to be called the *agape*. Here we may find a genuine and unmistakable survival of the Dominical Fellowship meal with His followers. It may have been commemorative as well of the Miraculous Feedings. Despite Völker's argument that there are no genuine *Agapes* until the days when, in the middle of the second century, anti-Gnostic controversy demanded them as counter-propaganda, it appears that they are primitive and long-lived observances in the social life of the Christian Fellowship. Keating's *Essay*, now twenty-eight years old, is still our best study, if it be remembered that the Hippolytan evidence was not in his hands as yet recognized as second century in substance.

III

When we turn to early Christian documents outside the N.T. we have, among others, for the second century, Ignatius, the *Didache*, Justin Martyr, and Hippolytus († 235). Ignatius does not know of an *agape* separate from the Eucharist, and his Eucharistic language can scarcely be applied to the *Agape*. The *Didache* seems to postulate a continued Eucharist-*Agape*. In Justin the *Agape* is conspicuous by its absence. In Hippolytus we have two distinct types—Roman and Egyptian—of the *Agape*, and a thoroughly different and distinct Eucharist. All of these, pre-eminently Hippolytus, are of prime consequence for the study of Eucharist origins and development.

A. In the *Didache* rite (described ix.-x., alluded to in xiv.) we have either (a) prayers for congregational use—a kind of “lay-folk's mass-book”—or (b) the actual description of the rite giving the words used by the officiant. The sequence of ix.-x. suggests that the Eucharist here spoken of is the post-baptismal First Communion, procedure at which is to be normative for the communicant's future experience, for vii. begins: “Concerning baptism, baptize ye thus . . .,” etc.; viii. has to do with fasting and prayer; ix. begins: “Concerning the Eucharist, thus do ye hold Eucharist” (*περὶ δὲ τῆς εὐχαριστίας, οὕτως εὐχαριστήσατε*). That the term is technical appears from ix. 5 (“Let none eat or drink of your Eucharist except those who have been baptized,” etc.). Chapters ix. and x. contain each three prayers, each with its own doxology. The concluding paragraphs of the two sections are in the nature of rubrics (e.g., ix. 5, only the baptized to partake; x. 7, “suffer prophets to celebrate the Eucharist [or give thanks] as they will”). All six prayers have in view, and use as their point of departure, current Jewish prayers; in fact, Judaism conditions the outlook

of the *Didache* throughout (i.-vi. is a revamped Jewish manual of instruction for proselytes; viii. 1-2, neither fast nor pray as the "hypocrites" [Jews] do). The third prayer in each group is for the whole Church (ix. 4; x. 5). The meaning of the first prayer (in x. 2), according to Lietzmann, is: "God's Name, that is, God's Might, God's Spirit, has through His heavenly food taken up its dwelling within the communicants" (*M. u. H.*, p. 235). God who "has given spirit-infused food and drink" (x. 3) to His own has thereby given "eternal life through His Child" (*παις*). The whole rite receives further illumination in xiv.: "On the Lord's day of the Lord" (probably militantly anti-Jewish!) "come together and break bread and hold Eucharist, having first confessed your transgressions that your sacrifice may be pure. Let none who has a quarrel with his fellow join himself together with you until they be reconciled, lest your sacrifice be defiled." Then follows (xiv. 3) the quotation of Mal. i. 11, 14. On the whole, the tenor of the document suggests that it was not written for ecclesiastics but for lay-folk, hence the more probable interpretation is that ix.-x. represents a layman's devotional manual rather than a liturgical text for the guidance of clergy. It is difficult, then, to justify the basis of Lietzmann's conclusion (p. 238) that in the *Didache*, since we have no mention in it of the memorial of Jesus' death, or of His Body and Blood of the Covenant, or of the Last Supper, we possess a type of the Lord's Supper that is based on neither the Markan nor Pauline tradition.

B. Ignatius' *Epistles* give us no description of the rite, but supply us with phrases and terms of outstanding significance for his interpretation of the meaning of the Eucharist. It is to be observed by Christians in obedience whole-hearted and sincere to the "bishop and presbytery, breaking one bread (*κλῶντες*), which is the medicine of immortality, the antidote against our dying, but that we should forever live in Jesus Christ" (*Eph. xx. 2*). Further references in the same vein are in *Trall. viii. 2*, *Rom. vii. 3*, and *Phil. iv.*: "Strive diligently to observe one Eucharist. For there is one flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ and one cup unto union with (*εἰς ἐνωσιν τοῦ αἵματος αὐτῶν*) His blood, one altar, as there is one Bishop," etc. *Smyrn. vii. 1* reads: "The (docetic heretics) abstain from Eucharist and prayer since they do not confess that the Eucharist is the flesh of our Saviour Jesus Christ which suffered for our sins, which (flesh) the Father in His kindness raised up. They therefore who speak against the gift of God in their contentious disputes die. It were far better for them to love (*ἀγαπᾶν* = observe Eucharist ?) that they may also rise again." His words

as to the "medicine of immortality"** were possibly liturgical in Ignatius' day; at all events, there are definite signs of their subsequent liturgical use (as in Serapion's *Anaphora*, xiii. 15, the Berlin fragment, a Gallican anaphora, etc.). The intimate juncture in St. Ignatius' mind, between the reality—if it may be so termed, *symbolic* reality—of the Eucharistic elements with the body and blood of the Incarnate, the "one altar" (which, of course, entails the sacrificial thought back of body-blood, natural and Eucharistic), and the fruits or effects of Communion as immortality, enables us to see more in his words than he states explicitly. His witness is indubitably for the tradition which is fast growing in definite outline as we survey the literature.

C. *Justin Martyr* describes the rite for the outside world in his first *Apology* (circa 150-155): "On Sundays there is an assembly of all those dwelling in town and countryside into one place, and the memoirs of the Apostles or the writings of the prophets are read as time permits" (67). This is our first information as to the Gospels and Epistles being used together with the O.T. prophets in Christian worship. The service of the Eucharist he depicts in untechnical language; the "presiding officer" receiving the bread and cup of wine and water, offers praise and glory to the Trinity and "makes a eucharist" that the gifts be acceptable. At the end the people answer Amen. The deacons communicate the people present as well as absent with the "thanked-upon bread and wine-and-water" (chap. lxv.), which is not any longer common food. "In the same fashion as Jesus Christ our Saviour was made flesh through the Word and had flesh and blood for our salvation, so, we are taught, the food, thanked-upon by the prayer of the word from Him—which food nourishes blood and flesh by a change of its nature (*κατὰ μεταβολήν*)—is the flesh and blood of that very Incarnate Jesus." He then gives his account (drawn from the "memoirs" of the Apostles) of the Institution, concluding with a side-glance at the demon-inspired mystery-cult of Mithras, which imitates these things (chap. lxvi.). He finds the bread of the Eucharist foreshadowed by the meal-offering of the Old Law, prescribed for cleansing from leprosy (cf. Lev. xiv. 1-32). The Jewish sacrifices have been abrogated in the new Gentile sacrifice, which is "of the Bread of the Eucharist and of the Cup of the Eucharist" (*Trypho*, 41, quoting Mal. i. 10 ff.). Note (1) the curious use of the Greek verb and noun, *εὐχαριστεῖν*, *εὐχαριστία*, is strikingly like Yiddish words of technical connotation, such as *bensch*,

* Cf. on *φάρμακον ἀθανασίας*, A. D. Nock, in *Journal of Theological Studies*, December, 1929.

davan, "to make motsi," which derive respectively from Latin (*benedicere*), Arabic, and Hebrew! This use might be described as Yiddish-Greek, as we have no discernible instances of its *κοινή* use outside Jewish or Christian circles. (2) The effect of the "thanking-upon" the bread and mixed chalice is to do something to them: "they are no longer common bread and wine, but we are taught that they are Christ's Body and Blood." (3) The analogy verges perilously near to a foreshadowing of Transubstantiation: by *μεταβολή* the bread and wine nourish the natural body and blood; so they become by the word of prayer from the Word of God the Body and Blood of the Incarnate. The assimilated food loses its identity in becoming what it was not, and nourishes, by being assimilated, that which consumes it. It would be easy to press too far what after all is but an illustration and analogy. (4) The Eucharist has as its type a sacrifice of the old Jewish law, which it has now supplemented and abrogated by becoming the Gentile sacrifice. Such terminology is not simply figurative and metaphoric, for it would have been hazardous in the extreme to utilize what might so readily have been misconstrued. St. Justin meant emphatically what his words imply.

F. GAVIN.

(To be concluded.)

EUCHARISTIC DOCTRINE

RECENT articles in THEOLOGY, together with recent publications and conferences, are raising afresh the question as to whether a reconciliation can be effected between different schools of thought upon Eucharistic doctrine. That such a reconciliation is possible must be admitted by all, since truth is always consistent with itself. History shows that partisans drift further and further apart simply because they are stressing one aspect of the Catholic vision to the neglect of others. Recent discussion, however, seems to be paving the way for some restatement of the Church's doctrine on modern lines, and in terms which could be accepted by all. Its language, of course, would still be interpreted differently by different individuals. Yet to imagine that a formula capable of divergent explanations is therefore valueless, is a strange misunderstanding. No two persons mean exactly the same thing when they recite the Creed or join in saying the Paternoster. Organized religion must have some common terminology, and Anglican formularies have always been patient of more than one interpretation.

Our policy is—in words now well known—"not compromise for the sake of unity, but comprehension for the sake of truth." Any effort at synthesis today will deliberately aim at securing and preserving the positive contribution which any of our schools are ready to make. And, in view of the present situation, it seems to some of us that a notable opportunity will soon arrive for a fresh venture at Catholic interpretation.

Perhaps the first requisite will be a frank reconstruction in the use of such a phrase as the "Doctrine of the Real Presence." The expression has long been in use, but from the beginning it has involved misunderstandings, which indeed are inevitable. Both terms need interpretation. The word "Presence" also suggests "Absence"; and if "Real" means actual and not imaginary, it is quite otiose; while if it is intended to mean objective as opposed to subjective, or spiritual as opposed to material, the term is unable to carry and express such ideas without lengthy explanation. As the Archbishop of York has pointed out, what has been implied by the phrase "Real Presence" has always been relative to individuals, and that which it denotes is "Accessibility" and not simply extension in space and time: that which is "present," he says, is "that which is directly apprehensible."

Of course, the adjective "Real" has also been intended to preserve the truth that in the Eucharist there is a *res sacramenti*, which distinguishes it from all other sacraments. Consecration at the altar means something more than consecration at the font. The water at baptisms nowadays is hallowed for a sacred purpose. Yet at first baptisms were held in running water, as they often are today in the mission field. And even as late as the middle of the fourth century adults were being baptized in the Jordan at the traditional site of our Lord's Baptism. On the other hand, the consecrated elements at the liturgy were from the beginning treated with scrupulous respect, because they were regarded as having been changed and transfigured by what had taken place. But the term "Real," especially when it is set as it is here in connection with "Presence," seems incapable of expressing either the nature or even the reality of the change effected by consecration.

Apart from terminological difficulties, the chief objection to the phrase lies in the fact that it tends to invert the right way of approach to the problem, going back as it does to the theophanies of the Old Testament. Revelation has advanced, historically, from the particular to the universal. A tribal and territorial Deity comes to be realized as the God of all lands and races. The first-born is sacrificed, to show that all Nature's increase comes from God. A temple is consecrated,

but the universe is not big enough for the Divine dwelling-place. One day in seven is to be kept holy, in order that all days may be seen to be equally divine. Some meats are clean and some unclean, so that by degrees man will understand that all are cleansed by an act of thanksgiving to their Donor. In the story of the Old Testament religion is depicted as starting with the particular and trying to rise through it to the universal; and in the New Testament the universal is at last revealed. For us, therefore, everything depends upon our starting-point—viz., whether we begin with the particular and attempt through it to reach the universal, or whether we begin with the universal and then descend to the particular. The former method is pre-Christian, the latter alone is Catholic. Commencing as in the New Testament with the universal, the representative character of Sacraments must always be kept in the foreground, if we are to be saved from relapsing into pre-Christian categories. “To lose sight of the representation of the universal,” as Canon Quick has written, “has been the most common aberration” in sacramental theory, and the chief ground on which the accusation of magic has been based.

This approach from the side of the universal ought to be specially characteristic of interpretation by Catholic minds, flowing from their definite vision of the Church as the organ of Redemptive Purpose. Protestantism, on the other hand, has tended here to fail. It has been apt to regard our Lord’s Ascension as a “going away” from this earth, and to look upon Him as One who will indeed come again to judge the world, but who has meanwhile left it more or less to itself. To a devout group the Lord will reveal His Presence, and the faithful soul can ever rejoice in the Spirit of the Christ dwelling in the heart of the believer. But apart from such particular manifestations to a group or to an individual, Protestantism as a whole has failed to appreciate the witness of the Church to the abiding presence of the risen and ascended Christ amongst His people. In the appointed ordinances of the Catholic Church—all of which are themselves occasions when two or three are gathered together in His Name—the Christ makes Himself known to His disciples by acts which attest His unseen Activity. Our Lord is really “present” at every Baptism, Confirmation, Absolution, etc., as He is at the Eucharist. Any of the sacramental operations of the Church forms—in the phrase which Dr. Liddon applied only to the Eucharist—“a chartered point of contact” between the Christ and His people. The Sacraments thus witness to the continuance of the Lord’s work. As Canon Lilley concludes, this truth cannot be “better expressed than by saying that Christ Himself is the real Minister

of every Sacrament, using the visible acts and audible words of an earthly minister appointed to that end."

We commence then with the permanent and universal Presence of the Christ with His people, of which the Sacraments constitute the appointed framework. That which distinguishes the Eucharist from other Sacraments must be found, not in the Presence, but in the Action of which it testifies. Why has the Church from the beginning regarded the Prayer of Consecration as something unique, different from all other prayers? Here the appeal of our Reformers to the early Church assumes a fresh importance, in view of the notable increase during the last half-century in our knowledge of liturgical developments during the formative period in the story of our religion. To some, of course, an appeal to the primitive centuries appears, in the incisive language of Dean Inge, "a return to the rattle and the feeding-bottle." But such comment, however effective in an evening newspaper, really misses the point. No one imagines that Justin Martyr or Irenæus or any of the early fathers has said the last word on Eucharistic theory. Chancellor Srawley is probably justified in describing the primitive belief as a "naïve realism." It is the *Lex Orandi* of the early Church, rather than its *Lex Credendi*, as it may be voiced by any one individual, which deserves a sympathetic scrutiny. By degrees, and at different times in different places, the Love-Feast became finally separated from the Eucharist, and the Eucharist itself came to assume a more or less settled form of procedure. Neither the primitive ceremonial nor the primitive terminology can, or ought to, be meticulously reproduced by us of today (though there are some who would like to see the position of the Celebrant restored to the primitive model, which the Pope preserves still at St. Peter's in Rome). But it is well worth while to try and recover the devotional outlook of the early Church, the atmosphere of her public assembly, and the feeling that pervaded her acts of common worship.

Here the liturgical discoveries of the last half-century are of real value. We are now aware of the normal form of the Prayer of Consecration in the primitive Church. It followed—as was natural to an utterance still in the main extemporary—the order of the Creed, commemorating first the Father's work in Creation, and then passing to His work in Redemption, including in this a repetition of our Lord's own words and deeds in the Upper Room and a presentation of the Memorial which He had enjoined, and ending with an invocation of the Holy Spirit alike upon the worshippers and the sacred elements. It is not so much the exact position of the Epiclesis which is here of supreme importance, but the general tenor of the Prayer

and its emotional value as a corporate embodiment of the Church's faith. Several years ago Bishop Gore drew attention to its psychological effect. The belief in Christ as the unseen Minister of the rite, to quote his words, "anticipated and so weakened the emotion following upon the Consecration. What that brought about was, not the presence of Christ—He was already there—but His adoption of the Church's gifts to become His Body and His Blood. Henceforth an attention and worship already given to Christ as present was more or less focussed upon these holy symbols and instruments." There is no reason, however, why, for us of today, the emotion roused by the Act of Consecration should be weakened because of our conviction that the Christ is already present. What we have to recover is the prominence assigned by the early Church to the great "Amen." As we are now aware, it was the whole Prayer, and the Prayer as a whole, which the early Church felt as effecting the Consecration. The action of the unseen Lord, reproduced by the officiating priest, was ratified and completed by the worshippers' "Amen." Their "Yes, Yes, Yes!" marked the climax, and we have to try and restore the great "Amen" to its rightful position today in the minds of worshippers as a whole. The Consecration will then be understood to be the joint act of priest and people, combined with that of their invisible Lord, and their adoration will be directed towards the sacred elements in view of the purpose for which they are to be used. This congregational aspect of worship is one of the great lessons which we learn from the example of the primitive Church and its stress on the reality of the lay priesthood. It has indeed been said that congregational worship was "invented by Christianity," the Christian temple differing from the pagan mainly in the fact that it was intended to contain the worshippers inside the building, which was erected for one dominant purpose—viz., to house the Action of the Liturgy. Of course, it provides a matchless focus for private devotion. But, historically, the worship of the Church has always been intended to be congregational. And it is the corporate and social which we of today wish to emphasize, and to do so at the very heart of our religion.

What we seem to need, therefore, is some term that is able to express in a modern way the result of Consecration. Any language which suggests a Presence "under the forms" of bread and wine, or "under the Sacramental veils," is open to grave objection, all the misunderstandings to which the word "Presence" is liable being here intensified and deepened. That a change has been effected by Consecration has been the continuous belief of Catholic Christendom, although neither

its nature nor its moment were defined in the early centuries. How can we of today describe this fundamental conviction? "Transenergization" has been suggested by Mr. W. G. Peek. The Archbishop of York has put forward the term "Transvaluation," or "Convaluation." To quote his words, "If Transubstantiation means Transvaluation, the objections to it partly disappear." Luther's Consubstantiation "has the right devotional value; but, unfortunately, it is nonsense."

... If, however, Substance is understood to mean Value, the objections to Consubstantiation also disappear. Convaluation is, in fact, just what is wanted. The Bread still has the value of bread, and it has also the value of the Body of Christ."

This suggestion deserves a further scrutiny. Reality, for us of today—as the Archbishop has forcibly pointed out—usually turns out to stand for meaning, value, significance. And in view of the dominance on the one hand of the modern philosophy of values, and on the other the emphasis which is again being laid upon personality, it may well be that "Valuation" is the most useful term to express the Catholic doctrine in modern terminology. "Virtualism" may of course be expounded in a Catholic sense. But "Value" is better than "Virtue," in that the popular meaning of "virtually" involves a pretence, as signifying something that is practically as good as that for which it has been substituted. No such implication of subterfuge attaches to "Value," whether as a term or as a category of thought. The effect of the Prayer of Consecration may therefore be described as a change in the value of the sacred elements. They become charged with a new spiritual purpose. We can assert, can we not, that in the Mind of God they are now the Body and Blood of Christ, in virtue of the passing of the Divine Will into effect by the act and intention of the Church as a whole? Transvaluation is what has taken place. Can any term better express for us the result of the Liturgical Prayer? The word "Transubstantiation" is impossible, because the philosophy of substance and accidents has long been obsolete. And it was devised in order to justify mediæval developments, which were not in line with the procedure of the early Church. "Transmutation," "Transformation," "Transfiguration," etc., might be suggested. But none of these have a connotation so eloquent as "Value," preserving as it does the essence of the primitive belief. We need a term which contains not only the belief of the early Church but the truth underlying the principle of *ex opere operato*, which forms the sheet-anchor of Catholic devotion to the Sacrament. When we approach the Altar, we are not paying a call, in the hope

that our Friend may be at home and able to see us. We are accepting an invitation, and we know that our Host will be there, to welcome His guests and provide them with spiritual sustenance.

Of course the Dominical institution of the Eucharist is taken for granted in all Catholic discussion of this mystery. But after the convincing chapter by Dr. N. P. Williams in *Essays Catholic and Critical*, it can no longer be asserted that such an assumption is impossible for all who desire to share in the modern critical outlook upon Holy Writ. In the same volume also Dr. W. Spens gives his approval to "Transvaluation" as the best philosophical expression of the Sacramental doctrine for us of today. Is it not possible, therefore, that the essence of the Catholic conviction might be stated afresh in terms which the Evangelical, and even the Modernist, might accept, as well as the Anglo-Catholic? It might run, perhaps, somewhat on the following lines:

Accepting our Reformers' appeal to the early Church—viz., to the New Testament and to the formative period in the historic growth of our religion—we believe:

1. That our Lord on the eve of His Passion instituted a Service, in special commemoration of His Death, which He wishes His Church to observe regularly;
2. That the Catholic Church has been right in regarding the Lord's own Service from the beginning as the central fact in her worship, round which all other of her services have gathered;
3. That in virtue of the promise of His abiding presence with His Church, our Lord is Himself the real Minister in every Sacrament, using the visible acts and the audible words of an earthly minister appointed to that end;
4. That the Liturgical Prayer, taken as a whole and ratified by the people's "Amen," constitutes the Consecration, as the act of the unseen Lord in which the officiating minister and the worshipping congregation alike have their mutual and distinctive parts to perform;
5. That such Consecration has a real effect, the consecrated elements being charged with a new spiritual significance and purpose, and being now the Body and Blood of Christ as well as bread and wine;
6. That the act of Consecration passes into effect in virtue of the Divine Will and of the intention of the Church as a whole, apart from the character or faith of individuals, though the

benefits of participation in the Sacrament depend upon the spiritual attitude of the worshipper;

7. That the faithful use of the Sacrament can alone reveal its inexhaustible meaning.

H. T. KNIGHT.

P.S.—Of course a further aspect of the mystery remains, viz., the problem of the Sacrifice. But in view of the Bishop of Gibraltar's recent essay, perhaps an opportunity for discussing it will present itself later on.

CONCERNING BENEDICTION

WE must concede at once that the Service called Benediction or corporate Devotions before the Reserved Sacrament is illegal in the English Church. If the Bishops of these provinces of the Catholic Church have forbidden, as they have, this Service, then we have no choice in the matter; this Devotion may not be given. It may be an eccentricity on the part of the Bishops: it is a movement away from the centre of devotional life in the Western Church. It may be an attempt to live in the past, for in the early Church such a Devotion was unknown. It may not be according to the primal purpose for which the Holy Sacrament was given. It may be a loss to the spiritual life of thousands of our people. Yet we have no right to move in opposition to the directions of the Episcopate. No one can say that such a Service is necessary for salvation in the sense that Communion is necessary. If that is so, then it is of the essence of Protestant individualism for priests and congregations in the teeth of authority to set forth on their own initiative this Devotion which is so great a help. It is idle to claim the right to it because it is practised by the rest of the Western Church. As well might we deny the right of the clergy to marry because the marriage of Roman priests is forbidden. A national Church has the right to make its own bye-laws.

Yet those of us who feel the imperative need of loyalty and obedience in this matter, who could not hold this Devotion in our churches, however much we may desire it, yet we would plead with our Bishops to reconsider the matter and to ask whether they cannot permit a form of Benediction in Anglo-Catholic churches, a form stamped with their permission. It is clear that Evensong is making but little appeal to the people. The broadcasting of Services has seriously affected evening congregations except among those whose evening worship

centres round the Reserved Sacrament. People can sit comfortably at home and hear good music and a good sermon. Yet there is no corporate worship in this. It gives pleasure; it conveys ideas; but it hardly stirs devotion; it is destructive of churchmanship; it is not "the assembling of ourselves together"; it does not put people *en rapport* with the unseen world; it gives a sense of wonder not at heaven but at wireless. What is to take the place of Evensong? Neither Compline nor the Services of Nonconformity are at all likely to hold the fort. These suffer with Evensong. Worship, corporate worship, is bound up with the Eucharist. The Mass is the centre of corporate worship, as the New Testament means it to be and as worship was developed in the Church. In the long run worship fades when this great Sacrament is neglected, and with it belief in the Divinity of our Lord, and the consciousness of the unseen world. The Service of Benediction links the evening and the morning worship together. "The evening and the morning were the first day." It leads men to realize that the Holy Sacrament is for them, and that the Divine Presence is everywhere in the world. To restrict the Divine Presence to the moment of Communion or to one Service is to suggest that the Presence is but at one place and time. Many have learned from the Reservation of the Sacrament to see God in all places and times. Reservation and Benediction are a means for combating materialism and for insisting on the reality of the unseen world in which we live and move and have our being. And Benediction is a simple Service: it points to one idea; it portrays one fact; it presents a Person. That idea is the reality of the spiritual world; that fact is Christ crucified; that Person is our Lord. It is difficult to conceive that our Lord, who welcomed and approved faith in the heathen and in the Samaritan, would forbid this Devotion or any form of adoration which is directed to God.

The practical appeal of Benediction may not be denied. Reservation, which carries with it the sense and fact of the Presence of our Lord not at one Service or at one moment, but with us "all the days to the end of the world," leads people to make the churches houses of prayer. In an interesting letter Von Hügel points out that before 1330 there was Reservation but no Devotions, and that probably in those days Catholics made no more use of churches for private prayer than do Protestants, but that with corporate Devotions the practice of prayer between times grew; it was the awakening of the Devotion to the Reserved Holy Eucharist that led people to pray in the churches. To this both Roman and Anglo-Catholic churches bear witness.

But, it is said, Communion is the purpose for which the Eucharist was given. Let us grant that all you can say about the utility of Benediction is true; yet it remains true that the purpose of this Sacrament is simply for Communion and for nothing else, and by this purpose we are bound. Yet it is right to allow for development; and development is under the guidance of the Holy Spirit. We have in Scripture, in the first purpose of a doctrine or a Sacrament, the seed; but the seed must grow. The purpose of the Eucharist is the perpetual representation of the "Sacrifice of the death of Christ," is the union of the believer with our Lord. Is, then, the rite of Benediction a true development of the purpose? Powerfully this rite presents Christ crucified and risen and ascended before the worshippers; else there is no meaning in the rite. What mean ye by this Service? To that there is but one answer; here is Christ who died on the Cross and rose again presented in His eternal ascension act of blessing His people; here is Christ "with men all the days to the end of the world"; here is Christ receiving worship. If this rite of Benediction, if the practice of the Reservation of the Holy Sacrament is a representation of Christ and of His Sacrifice, if it draws men to Him, if it preaches Christ, if it leads to the worship of "the Lamb as it had been slain yet alive for evermore," if it witnesses to Christ—and the whole function of the Church is to witness to Christ—then Reservation and Benediction are a true development of the purpose of the Eucharist. The first purpose of the Eucharist is not to be found in any benefit of Communion to the communicant, not found in the feeding of this or that soul with the Body of Christ; the first purpose, as the Catechism says, is that the Eucharist shall be the continual memorial of the Sacrifice of the death of Christ. "Do this in remembrance of Me." Christ is the centre of the Christian religion. He is the object of worship. His interests stand first. And if Benediction and Reservation so present Him, then these practices are in line with the purpose of the Eucharist; they are a true development.

There is a development of the Sacrament of Baptism. We baptize infants. Yet there is little indeed in the New Testament which leads us to suppose that at the beginning of the Church's life infants were baptized. Baptism was for the remission of sins, of actual sins; and there is more than a hint that for sin after Baptism there is no forgiveness. Certainly there is no mention in the New Testament of the Baptism of a child. We read that the gaoler was baptized with all his household; there may or may not have been children in the household. We are sometimes told that our Lord's words,

"Suffer little children to come unto Me," teach infant Baptism; as well might we say that they invite infants to come to Communion. Yet infant Baptism is a true development. The Church is the family of God; children are a part of that family; they are made members of the Body of Christ by Baptism; they are rightly brought into the life of the Church, thereby receiving all its influence, although the purpose of Baptism was for adults at their conversion and profession of faith in Christ. We are rather driven to the conclusion that infant Baptism is a more startling development of purpose than is the rite of Benediction from the purpose of the Eucharist. Both sprang from the instinct of the Church in the evolution of its worship and life; and both are justified by results.

While, then, giving obedience to the Bishops we would plead for permission to have the Service of Devotions. The Bishops are our Fathers in God; their sons and daughters are adults; and their wishes and spiritual aspirations ask to be heard. It is not the part of wisdom, we would respectfully suggest, to turn a deaf ear to the demands for worship, to insist upon Law "by which no flesh shall be saved," to attempt to rule the present by the past, to forbid a very real devotion to our Lord because it was not practised in the early Church or at the Reformation. "Religion is adoration," as Von Hügel said; and the sense, the practice of adoration is the need of our time, that and heroic living. The voice of authority and law can never still the working of the Spirit; it can but urge it to break out in violent ways. The way of faith, we would gently hint, is not to repress but to tolerate and direct. If this movement, this adventure towards the spiritual is of men it will come to nothing; if it is of God those who oppose it may be found to be fighting against Him. This is sure: the Holy Spirit makes His guidance seen not only in the writings of the learned, not only in Councils, but also in the wishes and yearnings of the multitude, in the desires of "the common people" to arrive at a deeper knowledge of God, to penetrate more richly the unplumbed deeps of the spiritual world, to find a stronger loyalty to our Lord. For it is never satisfaction of our spiritual needs that we crave. With each satisfaction comes a new craving, a more insistent appetite to find God, a quickening of spiritual energy which shall build us up in a closer union with the Divine than has yet been given to the restless heart of men.

J. H. B. MACE.

THE PLACE OF STUDY IN THE CHURCH*

IN July of last year the Archbishops of Canterbury and York sent to all the Clergy a Pastoral Letter in which they expressed their hope of a renewal of life and power in the Church, and their counsel as to the way by which the Church might prepare itself for such renewal. Put briefly, they said that the right preparation for such a hope was that the Church, first the pastor and then the flock, should seek by prayer and study to gain a deeper insight into the Gospel of Jesus Christ. They called upon us first to join together in this work, and then to help our people to do the same. We were left to work out for ourselves the plan which best suits our situation and the course of study to be followed. A course of study prepared by an Advisory Committee appointed by the Archbishops has been published, and it is said that others will follow. Nevertheless, we are quite free from any obligation to follow a prescribed course, and one of the things for which we are here to-day is to make up our minds about this. The other is to consider how we may best group ourselves for the purpose, and where and how often we should meet. At our last meeting I said that I would try to set before you my own thoughts about the prospect of renewal in the Church, and of the kind of teaching which our generation seems most to need. I confess that I have found the greatest difficulty in bringing these thoughts into order, so as to make clear to others what I seem myself to see. I am afraid that when all has been said you will feel that nothing has been said, and that we are exactly where we were before. But this is our difficulty, as anyone may discover who tries to do what we are set to do, as I am trying now.

Let us first consider how it is that such a message as this should need to be sent to us at all. It is because the Church is making no apparent headway, and in the opinion of many is actually declining in its influence upon the world. There was a time, though not in our memory, when the Church held the central place in the thoughts and interests of all the nations and peoples in Christendom. Whether those who ruled in her affairs did well or ill, whenever the Church concerned herself in any matter, her words and acts were watched with the most anxious interest. It is not so now. The hierarchy that rules the souls of men today claims no Apostolic succession, for it belongs to another spiritual order, and has a different spiritual origin and aim. But it also preaches a universal gospel, and receives a wider homage than the Church of Christ ever did, both here in England and in all other lands. Our altar may be in the City, but not at St. Paul's. We have other gods today.

* A paper read to the Henley Rural-decanal Chapter,

I do not think there can be any doubt that the heart of the trouble is an uncertainty about God which ends in a kind of idolatry. Men feel their need of a god, but he must be a god to suit themselves and their present urgent needs, such as the tribes of Israel demanded of Aaron. They do not want a god who reveals himself in awful majesty from heaven, but a god evolved out of their own hopes and fears. And if there come out of this fire a Golden Calf, or some other symbol of whatever stirs uneasily in a man's heart, let that be his god, and let each have his own.

It is this spiritual *dis-ease* that we should take note of, but we must not mistake its significance. It is often said that there is more interest in religion today than before the war, and that this interest is chiefly outside "institutional religion." It may be so, but if this is intended to mean that there is more religion, and better religion, outside the Church than within, I do not agree. This is one of those sayings which have a vogue for a time, because, by a certain ambiguity, they please a large number of people who are not accustomed to receive compliments. They give a measure of respectability to the old defiance, "I do not go to church, but I'm as good as those who do, and better than some." An interest in religion is not the same thing as the possession of a religion, and we ought not to use language which seems to say that it is. The more so because the trouble of our time is precisely this, that a great number of people have lost belief in the old religion, and have nothing firm and sure to take its place. So they are casting about "taking an interest in religion," pathetically eager to listen to anything that seems to offer some knowledge of God. But they do not come to the town and village churches to find Him, for the Presence has departed, and left for them an empty shrine. For them, but not for us, for we know how very opposite the truth is. But we have to face the fact that the Church's faith is now the faith of a few, and that these few cannot persuade the rest even to try to understand it, or to test the truth of what is said and passed on, quoted and re-quoted, against it.

This eager discussion of religion, with its rather contemptuous bias against the Church, is so much a feature of our time that it might well be considered in itself as evidence of a state of mind requiring to be understood, and if possible accounted for. Is it that the Church has been trusted too long, and at last found out? Is it that many do not really want God, but only a comfortable assurance about themselves? Is it that the Church has been unfaithful to the truth? Or is she too faithful to be endured? These, and others like them, are questions which underlie the religious situation of today, and they are not to be answered by assertion one way or the other. They afford matter for very honest enquiry, and occasion for very patient charity.

There is necessity laid upon all who would think and speak about religion, to have a profound reverence for, and sensibility to, the largeness of truth. I suppose everyone would agree to this. Nevertheless, is there any subject, with the possible exception of politics, upon which men of distinction who, in matters which they really understand, are careful and accurate in all they say, are so often reckless and inexact? It is supremely difficult to express oneself worthily and truly upon religion, and yet we find a vast demand for any kind of opinion upon it, and any number of people who are ready to satisfy that demand with the greatest assurance. It would be quite a useful part of our study to collect from popular newspapers, magazines and books, an assortment of the opinions and assumptions to be found in them, and to subject these to a careful examination. It would at all events help us to perceive the confusion in popular ideas which confronts the Church, and also to clear our own minds upon the subjects which at this time are so widely discussed. Perhaps I might venture to say under my breath that some of our ecclesiastical journalists who catch the public ear so cleverly, and are really great thinkers when they have time to take pains, might ponder their lighter words awhile before they cast them forth to fly to the ends of the earth. And it should, no doubt, be added that we ourselves, who have to speak and write so much upon this greatest of subjects, need to be more careful and better informed than we often are, lest our words should add to the cloud of perplexity which shuts out the light.

This applies notably to party controversy, which is certainly one of the major offences of religion to the man in the street, and to the man in the pew. How well we know the mischief done by the Prayer Book controversy! How the shame of it haunts us to this day! How the cloud of misunderstanding and cruel suspicion hangs about holy things, hiding their truth! All this is the fruit of party strife. I do not believe that controversy is the right way of discovering the truth, or of driving out "strange doctrine," certainly not that all too frequent sort of controversy which thrusts taunts and recriminations into the discussion of things which, if really believed, should move the mind to the deepest awe and reverence. But quite apart from that which is shameful and altogether indefensible, I feel that the controversial method must give place to a better, if we are ever to find unity in the truth, and I think the best men amongst us are showing us instead how to bring together in conference the elements which when forced apart breed error and conflict. The antidote to untruth is truth; there is no other, and none is needed. I do indeed believe that a change of method, with a change of tone, in this matter, would do

more to restore the credit of the Church in the eyes of ordinary people than almost anything else.

We find, then, not indeed as some say, a society which is more Christian than Christianity, more religious than the Church, but a society anxious about religion and in quest of it, uneasy, distrustful, credulous. We find it assailed by many voices, both without the Church and within. But we do not hear, clear and compelling, the Voice of a Gospel. There we are at fault; we, the Church, the embodiment of Christ on earth; and we, the apostles of His Gospel, the representatives to this age of a spiritual succession which should reveal its character in every word and act. We, who were set as a city upon an hill, are not the rallying point we were appointed to be. We know it right well, and we know also that though the Church is truly the custodian of the Universal Gospel, the candlestick which holds the Light of the World, that Light is hidden under the bushel of our uncertain faith.

If this be true, we see what we ought to be doing. The Church may not be responsible for the vagaries and confusions of the world, but she is responsible for the state of her own vision. And as soon as it becomes apparent that the weakness of her witness is due to the confusion of her own mind, the remedy also is clear. It is that we should apply ourselves again to first principles, and try to understand better than we have done the essential elements of the Gospel, and the nature and mission of the Church.

We need light to lead us to the heart of the Gospel. Then with this light we may take our minds away from our complex anxieties, and gain a large and simple vision of the Church. We may make a survey of its length and breadth and depth and height; its length in time, its breadth in worldwide extent, its depth in truth, its height in moral grandeur; in short, we may see it anew in its true Catholic character and nature.

It is within the Church itself that reassurance is chiefly needed, and will be most fruitful in reinstating the Christian Faith as a ruling power in men's lives. The weakness begins with and spreads from her own members, and I think for the most part we are more than half-conscious that this is so. If we of the Church were more solidly sure of the power of our Gospel, we should be less afraid of the forces which withstand it. We stand dubiously and uncomfortably in association with those who seem to be asserting claims too great to be tolerated, and we shrink from the situation. At the same time we know that the Church is right, for we have certain primary convictions as to what she is in the purpose of Christ, and because of these

we are bound to place her very high. We gain a vision of the ideal, and immediately the ideal is perceived to be the fact, and we know that the Church really and truly is what she ought to be. This must be so from the simple principle that she issues from the living Christ, the Son of God, whose Spirit dwells within her to be her Spirit. We know that the Church alone in all the world has (and is not merely seeking) a revelation of God upon which a full and universal salvation may rest, and that fulness of truth and grace are committed to her. We are bound to proclaim this tremendous doctrine, and to make this great claim, because it issues from first principles of the Gospel. But we know that the Church cannot be effective for these gifts except to faith, nor even possess them, except for faith. And if we shrink before a derisive world to assert for the Church all that we know must be true, is it not from a lurking fear that she may show up badly under trial of such claims? And if we are anxious about the integrity of her doctrine and sacraments, about her fitness to guard her own peculiar and most sacred trust, that must surely be because we have a feeling which cannot be shaken off, that faith, the condition of efficacy and of reality *to us*, is lacking somewhere, either from want of knowledge or for some moral reason.

Then again, from the same first principles of the Gospel, we have the certainty that the Church is one, and that this full salvation prepared for all mankind in Christ depends absolutely upon the solidarity of the Church's fellowship in Him being kept unbroken. From the nature of the Gospel there can be no salvation in schism, which is a denial of the Gospel at its very centre. And how could the Church more conspicuously and completely stultify all her claims, than by this state of schism within schism which, since the Reformation, has made a mockery of the very notion of a Catholic Religion and Church. Yet in spite of this, and the immeasurable evils which flow from such a situation, the ideal of the Church is the fundamental truth about her, and the failure of solidarity which all the world sees is a failure in faith, which brings loss to those who are thereby shut out from full participation in a unity which truly is. So, once again, if we are anxious about the integrity of the fellowship, as we have cause to be, we must seek the remedy in a clearer apprehension of the primary truth upon which it rests.

Or again, we know that the Way of Life, revealed in Christ and given to the Church that she might lead all men therein, is her Way of Life. Moreover it is, and always has been, in flat contradiction to the way of the world around it. The Church is holy, by the very fact of her life in Christ. This, too, is a claim which seems on the very face of it to be outside all reason, not

only to the observing world, but even to many of her members. Now it is not to be expected that the world, whose way is not her way, whose faith is not her faith, should see the Church as she truly is, and confess the holiness that belongs to her. One does not look there for the faith that gives insight. But when her own children do not know their mother, what then? What can we do but strive to learn once again, and more perfectly, what that Way of Life is which belongs to her holiness and is the Way which she must show (but can show only through us her members) to all men?

And finally, there is the supreme simplification of theology, expressed in the words "God is Love," with its moral counterpart, "he that dwelleth in love dwelleth in God, and God in him." As we contemplate this perfect doctrine, as day by day we renew ourselves by it in heart and will, there comes upon us a sense of rest in its completeness. Complexities are made simple, contradictions resolved, doubts set at rest, duties made plain. We perceive that everything, in the last analysis, is reducible to this; even as everything, in its first conception, proceeds from this. And as God begins and continues to the end, so also must we.

We see then, at point after point, that the Church's need at the present time is a simple one; it is to seek Christ afresh, and His Gospel. May I try to indicate the line of that quest, as it appears to me? *We must begin with what the Gospel says about God, and I think it would be well to start, not with the Synoptics, but with the fully developed Gospel of St. John.* In any case, the Church's Bible should be our guide, and not the critics' Bible. We need not dispute the truth of much that the critics say, but after all the Bible is an interpretation more than it is a history, and as such I believe it is nearer the truth by far than they are. I doubt the saving power of "Q," and I am sure we are better with the Bible as it is than we should be with any arrangement of the scraps which are left on the dissecting table of the critics. No doubt they are right on the whole in the analysis by which they disclose the structure of the documents, and the order in which they should be arranged historically. We may see by their help, for instance, the progress of the Lord's ministry, the stages of the Gospel as it was first preached and the growth of the disciples' understanding of it. Or we may trace the development in St. Paul's mind by which he reached the full expression of his theology.

At first I thought that we ought to follow this historical order in our study and our teaching, but I do not think so now. In study and teaching as distinct from research, we begin with the product of the evolutionary process of thought, not with its germ, and the value of the Bible and the Creeds to us is that they present the logical order of the Church's teaching as she has always

delivered it, not the historical process by which she reached the truth committed to her. For example, Jesus was revealed to be Christ the Son of God by His teaching and His works. The truth was unfolded in the historical process. But now that the revelation is complete, we read the words and works by its light; and then, throwing that light upon the historical process as it passes down the ages and now carries us along, are able to perceive its meaning also. That is what I mean when I say that the Bible should be taken as the Church gives it to us, for only so can it be called her message; only so can it convey to us the fruit of her experience in the Spirit of Christ.

I suggest, therefore, that we might study first *the Doctrine of the Incarnation, starting from the great prologue of St. John's Gospel*. From that we should pass naturally to the effects of the Incarnation—i.e., to the revelation of the true Way of Life as it was displayed in the Life of the Incarnate, to the doctrine of Redemption and Atonement as this was wrought by that Life, to the Doctrine of the Church as it issues from that Life, and as we proceed, to apply all this to the problems which confront the Church, and to those which arise day by day on the small scale and on the great.

Man cries out, in the smart of his pain, for some amelioration of the conditions of this present life—that and no more. It is natural enough. What Christ offers is the power to endure this life, to turn its sorrow into joy, and as the fruit of this, the gift of an eternal life. It is a doubtful Gospel; nevertheless this, the only Gospel which the Church has divine authority to proclaim, is in truth more radically healing than any other gospel could ever be; but it can heal only a believing world, and the world will not believe. The Church holds no message of deliverance for the world as it is, and her primary mission is not the betterment of man's lot in this present world, but the betterment of man himself. Our business is with the Word, the fruits of which will appear in their season, as the faith created by the Gospel grows and strengthens.

“This is the record, that God hath given us eternal life.”

“And this is life eternal, that they might know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent.”

ALLEN E. DAMS.

MISCELLANEA

NOTES AND COMMENTS

AMONG contributors to the present issue Dr. Gavin is Professor at the General Theological Seminary, New York; Canon Knight is Vicar of Shortlands, Kent; the Rev. J. H. B. Mace is Vicar of Holy Trinity, Winchester, and has an unusually wide experience of Study Circle work; and Canon Dams is Rector and Rural Dean of Henley.

The death of Canon Newbolt removes from St. Paul's one of its most familiar and best-loved figures, and from the Church of England one of its most fruitful and laborious workers. *The Times* described him as "the last of the Tractarians," and in many ways the term is applicable. But when *The Times* proceeds to describe the Tractarian movement as "a spent force," it is using much more questionable terms. It is true, of course, that a good deal of the Tractarian theology is now obsolete, and much that was most distinctive in the Tractarian character (as in the Victorian character generally) has gone with it. But no force can be regarded as "spent," when it has given rise to new developments and forms of expression that derive directly from it and are still increasingly active. That modern Anglo-Catholicism does so derive from the Tractarian movement is made clear by such recent studies as those of Dr. Brilioth and Dr. Stewart. What is perhaps even more striking is that the Tractarian theology, though on the whole strongly opposed to biblical criticism, itself enabled the Catholic movement, through its emphasis on the doctrine of the Church, to weather the storms of biblical criticism more successfully than any other school of thought in the Church of England. May this good guide and teacher of God's people rest in peace.

CORRESPONDENCE

DEAR SIR,

I hoped to find the correspondence started in June continued in July, but alas, no one seems to have come forward to suggest a more excellent way of approaching the problem stated so lucidly by Mr. Mackenzie. I rather hesitate to attempt to do so myself, because I feel it is one which ought to be tackled by somebody with a grasp of psychological and biological detail to which I can lay no sort of claim.

The most I can hope to do is to suggest a line of thought which I personally have found of value. There come times for all of us when the subject ceases to be one of purely speculative interest, and then it is that we discover a firm basis for our hope, if life is to retain its joy. I feel that the critical and sceptical frame of mind which we suffer from at such crises puts out of court the argument that the conclusions we reach then are mere "rationalizations."

In the first place I would call to mind, what I believe to be a fact, that belief in personal immortality, at any rate in Israel, grew in clearness and intensity as experience of, and belief in, a personal relationship to God now, supplanting an earlier conviction that God's interest was rather

in the tribe or nation than in the individual. In other words, as fellowship and communion with God became a very real and vivid experience, so the conviction was intensified that such fellowship could not be broken by death.

Then, while recognizing the undoubted place which continuity and development have had in the making of man, I recall that for a Theist there is another factor, even more fundamental, since it is, as it were, the background against which he sees the whole drama of the Universe as pictured by our ever-growing knowledge, namely God and the creature's relation to Him. Perhaps a quotation from von Hügel will make what I mean clear:

"God is the Supreme Good—of the stone and of the plant, of the animal, of man, of the angel, but in what wondrously various degrees both of self-communication on the part of God, and of consciousness on the part of the creature, as to this gift from God, and still more as to the Giver, God Himself! In proportion to the depth and the breadth of any creature's nature, the creature possesses, or can attain to, the consciousness that God is its sole pure delight."

Or we might take the opening words of the hymn:

*"Rerum Deus tenax vigor,
Inmotus in te permanens,"*

which I remember Canon Lacey expounding in a fascinating lecture which he gave to the S.T.C. at Cambridge more years ago than I care to calculate. However, the point I wish to emphasize here is the thought of the continual relationship between God and *all* that makes up what we call the Universe, a relationship which varies, as von Hügel has so eloquently expressed it, according to the nature and capabilities of the "creature." Starting from some such point as this, we can, I think, value at its true worth the antithesis of "extinction" or "survival" of which Mr. Mackenzie makes so much in his statement of the difficulty attached to the conception of immortality.

There is an eloquent passage in von Hügel's address on *The Idea of God*, Section 2, too long to quote here, which supplements the passage from *Facts and Truths concerning God* already given. In it he speaks of the Universe as:

"... a whole, in which matter and spirit, crystal, plant, animal and man, the various levels of richness to be known and of consciousness to know, will all variously but most really each require, stimulate, aid, check and fulfil all the others."

It is just this unity of creation in and, as I have put it, against the background of God which makes the problem as Mr. Mackenzie states it seem unreal. "All live unto Him," said St. Paul, and although humanity alone was in his mind, yet "the whole creation" may truly be included, so that Maeterlinck's "There is no death" comes to be truer and more inclusive than the writer perhaps thought.

When Dr. Oman was reviewing Otto's *The Idea of the Holy* in the *Journal of Theological Studies* (vol. xxv., pp. 275-286), he described an experience of his own which was undoubtedly shared by the horse he was riding; and Sir William Ramsay in the prologue to his little book, *The Education of Christ*, quotes from the Christmas number of the *Idler*

of about the year 1895 an incident which had happened to a cowboy of the Prairies. Here, too, the beast as well as the man had the experience. Is it altogether fanciful to believe that there really are "various levels . . . of consciousness to know" God? If not, then the contrast between the "two parents . . ." and the "offspring" will not be that the former would perish and the latter survive, but that the continued relationship to God would differ according to their different capabilities of appreciation.

I am afraid the above is vague and ill-expressed, but I think it shows a way of approach which makes the difficulties raised by Mr. Mackenzie of less account. "In knowledge of whom standeth our eternal life" are words familiar to all users of the Prayer Book—that is our starting point. To quote von Hügel once more:

"The religious soul does not seek, find, or assume its own Immortality; and thereupon seek, find, or assume God. But it seeks, finds, experiences, and loves God; and because of God, and of this, its very real, though still very imperfect, intercourse with God—because of these experiences . . . it finds, rather than seeks, Immortality of a certain kind" (*C.Q.R.*, vol. lxxxiv., p. 53).

MAURICE FROST.

DEDDINGTON VICARAGE,
OXFORD.

LAMBETH CONFERENCE REVIEWS

I

I. (b).—THE CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE OF GOD IN RELATION TO NON-CHRISTIAN RELIGIONS AND IDEALS

I ADMIT that my chief feeling after reading the section of the Report of the Lambeth Conference on which the Editor has invited me to comment is one of disappointment. No doubt it would have been foolish to expect in such a document more than a very general indication of the principles which, in the judgment of the Committee appointed to draw it up, should determine the direction of Christian thought upon the subject. There was not room for more, nor could it be reasonably demanded that, upon many points which might be raised in relation to such a subject, some twenty to thirty Bishops should commit themselves to a unanimous opinion. Yet there are some questions, concerning which those who are alive to certain urgent difficulties that present themselves to the minds of Christians desirous of giving to themselves and others a reason for the faith which is in them might naturally look for guidance to such a body, but as to which not even a hint is afforded by the Committee that its members were aware of their existence; while, on the other hand, space has been found for a somewhat dry and not very well-proportioned account of certain non-Christian faiths, of which it would not be unjust to say that it ought not to have been so full, if it were not to be fuller.

Before entering upon an attempt to justify this criticism I should, however, like to express gratitude for the Resolution of the Conference which comes nearest to dealing with the matter discussed in the section of the Report now before us. This is the fourth Resolution, and (except that I do not know why the sentiment of the Celtic race is not allowed

a place in it along with that of the Teutonic and the Slavonic) seems to state very well the truth about the universal mission of Christianity, in so far as that could be briefly stated without anything being said of other religions. The omission of any reference to them is presumably intentional, though I do not know what the reasons for it may have been.

To return to the Report. The problem of the relation of "religion" to "religions" is a problem that one might have thought demanded some notice from the Committee. We miss, indeed, the assumption, in former days so familiar, that all religions but Christianity and Judaism are, without qualification, "false," having nothing in common with ours beyond those abstractions from the content of the religious experience gained in common by adherents of various historical religions which passed as "doctrines of national religion." Since this assumption is barely compatible with the acceptance of the principle of evolution as applicable to the religious history of mankind, can only be made by ignoring the evidence of comparative anthropology, and is out of harmony with the tendencies of the best missionary teaching of today, we miss it from the Report without regret and without surprise. But its absence might well have seemed to make it all the more imperative to include some indication of the sense in which the Committee would distinguish (if it would distinguish) "revealed" religion from any other, would reconcile (if it is prepared to reconcile) the application to the religious history of mankind of an analogy from the evolution of organic life with the assertion that the Christian religion teaches "the truth" about God, or would allow (if it is willing to allow) the recognition of "religion" as a word descriptive of a real common nature exhibited in different ways by the various historical "religions," Christianity among them. For it is not merely students of philosophy who are seriously troubled by the questions at which I have been hinting. The wide diffusion of knowledge, acquired through the investigations of anthropologists, of the history of religion and especially of the bearing of that history upon the criticism and interpretation of the Bible, has for many educated persons made a feeling of uncertainty as to the special status of Christianity a real obstacle to that decided acknowledgment of our own religion as God's authentic revelation of Himself which is the necessary presupposition of a whole-hearted surrender of oneself to its claim upon one's life. A very few sentences would have sufficed to suggest the direction in which the Committee would have Christians to look for the removal of this feeling of uncertainty; and one cannot but be disappointed at finding no explicit recognition of the existence of the feeling or of the need for its removal.

As I have already said, I venture to think that the account of "non-Christian religions and ideals" given in the Report is not well-proportioned. I mean that, while it gives some information which might have been spared from so brief a discussion, to some points, relating to its subject, on which many would have welcomed guidance from such a quarter, the Committee has made no reference at all.

For example, Amida-Buddhism, a living theistic religion, presenting so many striking parallels to Christianity that some scholars have maintained it to have been of Christian derivation, is not mentioned at all; for whatever the origin of the name given to its Supreme Being, it can hardly be said to be adequately covered by the remark that later Buddhism "deified not only the Buddha, but also the founders of the sects." Again, to come nearer home, nothing is said of what Mr. Fisher

has called "our new religion," Mrs. Eddy's "Christian Science" (the ideals of which, Christian though it be called, we can hardly suppose the Committee of Bishops to have regarded as in any true sense entitled to the name); and this despite its obvious attraction for many among our own people who have been brought up as Christians and reckon themselves to be such. It would have been of real benefit, had the Committee pointed out that, in the former of these instances, although there is a genuine agreement with Christianity in certain of its ideals, there is no such historical warrant for their manifestation "in the flesh" as Christianity affords; and that, in the latter, the agreement with Christianity in the acknowledgment of the historical Jesus as the Revealer of the true way of life is neutralized by the profound discrepancy between its ideals and those with which the confession of the name of Christ is historically associated.

Moreover, whether illustrated by this contrast between Amida-Buddhism and Christian Science or not, the distinction and relation between the recognition of Christian ideals and the acceptance of the historical truth of the Christian tradition respecting Jesus might well, I think, have been indicated; and an opportunity has been lost in leaving it unmentioned except for the passing allusion on p. 74 to "the philosophic Hindu, who holds that eternal truth cannot be based on historical events" and who is therefore offended by the place assigned in the Christian doctrine of God to "the life of the historic Christ who appeared in Palestine two thousand years ago." For the philosophic Hindu has many sympathizers among philosophically (and mystically) minded people in this and other English-speaking countries. Might it not have been pointed out without undue prolixity that, on the one hand, the acknowledgment of Christian ideals apart from the acceptance of the "historicity" of Christ is a departure from Christian tradition involving the loss of the peculiar support which traditional Christianity gives to men in their pursuit of those ideals by its proclamation of their incarnation in the person of Jesus and of the presence in the world of a spiritual life flowing from Him and embodied in the Christian community, which can communicate to individuals the power in some measure to realize them; but that, on the other hand, the acceptance of the "historicity" of Christ can have no religious value at all apart from the recognition of the divinity of the ideals of which He is the "author and perfecter"?

I remember the late Baron von Hügel telling me with amused sadness how a friend of his, once, like himself, a Roman Catholic Christian, who has passed from the "modernism" of thirty years ago to a very negative attitude toward traditional Christianity, had written to him that they were not even now after all so far apart, since he (the friend) still believed in the historical existence of Jesus and of Peter. No doubt those miss something which is an essential part of the contribution made by Christianity to the spiritual treasure of humanity, who believe in Christian ideals without believing that Peter and the disciples of whom he was the chief really went out into the world preaching good news about the real life and death and resurrection of their Master. Yet the language which, for shortness' sake, we inevitably sometimes use in describing the distinctive beliefs of Christians does unquestionably often obscure the truth that the value of belief in the "historicity" of Peter's preaching and of Him who was its theme depends on the value of that divine life of love which was manifested in our Lord and which it is the primary purpose of His Church from Peter's days to ours to inspire and to foster in those

whom it summons to share its fellowship. It would have been no irrelevance if it had occurred to the Lambeth Committee on "the Christian doctrine of God" shortly to point this out as a fact to be borne in mind in studying the relation of that doctrine to non-Christian religions and ideals.

The Report mentions the "inclusiveness of Hinduism" and also the view of "the philosophic Hindu" that "history belongs to the phenomenal world and is limited, evanescent and illusory." I do not quite understand what is meant by "limited" here, and I should have thought that the word "only" should have been added after "belongs." For one can scarcely suppose that anyone holds history *not* to belong to the phenomenal world. But it might, without any undue lengthening of the Report, have been pointed out that the "inclusiveness of Hinduism" is closely connected with its view of history; and that the conception of the various systems of religion which have appeared among men as on a level with one another, as all alike symbols of one eternal and super-historical Reality to which it is the aim of the true seeker after God so to penetrate as to be able to dispense with any such symbol—a conception which, while not confined to Hinduism, is more congenial to its temper, as exemplified in its doctrine of repeated incarnations, than to that of any other among the great religions of the world—is probably the principal rival of the conception, congenial to Christianity with its insistence on the uniqueness of the incarnation of God in Christ, of a universal religion with a real history, to which the contributions made by the different religions are each of them unique and uninterchangeable. The extension throughout the world, which the improvement of the means of communication due to the immense progress made by mechanical science during the past century has rendered possible, of an economic or material civilization tending to obliterate racial and national distinctions, demands the appearance of a universal religion capable of imparting a soul to this civilization. One would not, I venture to think, be rash in risking the affirmation that such a religion must be based upon one of the two conceptions which I have described, and must thus find its chief inspiration from the past either in philosophic Hinduism or in Christianity; while in the latter event it must be in fact not merely harmonious, but organically continuous with historical Christianity. But, if this be so, a clear discrimination of the two conceptions and an intelligent grasp of the grounds on which the second may be preferred to the former will be an essential part of any Christian doctrine of God and of His revelation of Himself which takes account of the times in which we live.

Very little is said in the section of the Report upon which I am commenting about Judaism. Yet here, too, there was surely an opportunity for affording guidance which is much needed. For, while of the Christian communities over which the Bishops who were assembled at Lambeth preside, only a few are in close and frequent contact with the adherents of other religions, most of them have followers of the Jewish religion dwelling in their midst; and the English-speaking peoples have been honourably distinguished among the nations professing Christianity for their more considerate behaviour to their Jewish neighbours and their greater readiness to admit them to social and political equality with themselves. This being so, it would have been of real service had the Lambeth Committee seen its way to make some remarks, under the head of "non-Christian religion and ideals," upon the agreement and the difference of

moral and spiritual outlook which exist between the two faiths which are alike rooted in the religion of ancient Israel.

There is often a good deal of misunderstanding on this subject. On the one hand we find a tendency to regard a religious difference which does not seem to affect the ordinary intercourse of social life any more than does that which divides from one another Christians of different "denominations" as therefore of no more importance than the latter. On the other hand, among those Christians whose interest in religious and theological questions prevents them from thus ignoring the difference between Jews and Christians, there is sometimes a tendency to claim, as specifically Christian, elements in the moral and religious ideals of Christendom which Jews would claim as specifically Jewish; forgetting that, however great the emphasis one may be disposed to lay upon the originality and novelty of our Lord's teaching in respect of the Judaism of His day, it was unquestionably a most important part of the mission of Christianity to domesticate in the Gentile world the ethical traditions of Israel; so that much which distinguishes the ideals of Christendom from those not only of classical antiquity but of a large part of the world which has either not accepted or has rebelled against Christianity is in fact the common heritage of Jew and Christian.

In the narrower circle of those who occupy themselves with the scholarly discussion of the relations of Judaism and Christianity one sometimes finds (though perhaps more conspicuously in Germany than in this country) a tendency to lay a disproportionate stress on the polemic against Judaism contained in the New Testament to the neglect not only of the fact that the Old Testament was the ever-present background of the religion and morality of the New Testament writers, but of the further fact that, despite rare protests from Marcion and others, historical Christianity has ever consistently affirmed the inspiration of the Old Testament and that traditional Christian sentiment has regarded it as no less really forming part of the "Word of God" than the New, even although a larger proportion of the precepts contained in it has been taken not to be in a literal sense permanently binding upon the people of God.

I have found the section of the Lambeth Report upon which the Editor has asked me to comment so disappointing that I suspect myself of having altogether misconceived the intention of the Committee which drew it up. If, as is very possible, it was not the design of the Bishops to suggest principles for the guidance of those who should read the Report in dealing with the more obvious problems presented to Christians by the consideration of "non-Christian religions and ideals," but only to mention a few outstanding facts about some of these religions and ideals, my remarks will have been, as a criticism of their work, irrelevant. In that event, I hope that they will nevertheless serve the purpose of suggesting some not unprofitable lines of thought to the readers of **THEOLOGY**.

CLEMENT C. J. WEBB.

II

II. (a)-(c).—SOCIOLOGICAL ISSUES

In **THEOLOGY** for May, 1930, the editorial article, p. 245, had the following reference to some of the questions to be discussed at Lambeth: "The nature of the problems to be discussed in the second section betrays a clear consciousness of the Church's sociological functions."

This note was very welcome, as pointing out one aspect of the Anglican genius for applying the Faith of Christendom to the social surroundings in which the Church is to function.

The Society of Christ is to be "salt" and "leaven," not only in the lives of individuals in their action upon others, but also in the general social influence exerted upon secular conditions. Nothing can be left out of the dominion and the domain of God, for the purposes of His Kingdom.

The Anglican Communion may lack much that is desirable in unity and systematic thought, and may have no Aquinas, but there has always been a social tradition on Catholic lines. The work of Maurice and Kingsley, and the implications of the sacramental teaching of the Tractarians had their echo in the words of one of the Objects of the old Guild of St. Matthew (1877-1907), "to study social and political questions in the light of the Incarnation."

A very high standard was reached in this direction by the Fifth Report of the Archbishops on "Christianity and Industrial Problems" (1919). The 1920 Conference also made a strong pronouncement, the purport of which can be gathered from Resolutions Nos. 73 to 80 of that year. Those Resolutions are still maintained, and are quoted in the Report this year accordingly. No. 74 reads thus:

An outstanding and pressing duty of the Church is to convince its members of the necessity of nothing less than a fundamental change in the spirit and working of our economic life. This change can only be effected by accepting as the basis of industrial relations the principle of co-operation in service for the common good in place of unrestricted competition for private and sectional advantage. All Christian people ought to take an active part in bringing about this change, by which alone we can hope to remove class dissensions and resolve industrial discords.

But this year no special study was put down on the list of subjects so far as the economic situation has developed since 1920, and it may be regretted that this was not done, seeing that matters are far more serious now than they were just after the war. The chief factors in the change may be summarized thus:

(a) IMMENSE INCREASE IN PRODUCTIVE CAPACITY

Whilst many official utterances by statesmen and publicists are still far behind the facts, and wide of the mark in their remedies, in assuming that there is a "scarcity," the contrary is proving to be true, and the public are beginning to see it—namely, that the real trouble is our inability not to produce, but rather to distribute, goods and services. The Report notices this on p. 105:

It is a strange paradox that the capacity of the world to produce more than it needs of almost everything should coexist with extreme poverty in large areas of population, and the "discordance between consuming and producing power" calls for hard thinking and courageous action.

Soon after the war, when most people thought we were all very poor, a *Times* writer pointed out that *during* the war our productive capacity had increased fifty per cent. Since then the increase of supplies and

materials, and the advance of machinery and technique have intensified our potential wealth enormously. Moreover, the discoveries of science in connection with solar energy—with a certainty of vast developments to come—will make the support of an indefinitely increased population quite a simple proposition in the future, if a corresponding way of distributing nature's gifts is found, as it surely can be.

(b) CENTRALIZATION OF INDUSTRY

This has made great strides in the last ten years. In many key industries the growth of trusts, combines and interlocking syndicates is phenomenal. Without discussing the merits or otherwise of machinery (as things are now) let us hear what a great industrialist, Sir Arthur Balfour, says about the present position. "If sufficient people go out of business, and if sufficient plant is broken up, or dismantled, or put out of action by combinations, this might bring us a little nearer the time when we can have good trade for a reasonable period."

There must be something very much amiss when our actual abundance proves a hindrance instead of a help in social progress.

We feel the helplessness of a situation where the control of conditions seems always receding from our grasp.

(c) THE MONEY NEXUS

The enquiries and analysis of the last twelve years have shed much light upon the nature of money, and its relation to industry. There may be startling results when both social evolution and public opinion coincide to force a change in monetary policy. The discussion of a technical question like this would be out of place here. But it would be fair to say that there is a growing consciousness that the real centre of trouble lies in the series of financial assumptions and the policy based upon them in connection with money-power or credit.

Against these assumptions, people are beginning to demand that money ought to be regarded and used simply as a means of enabling the community to distribute the goods that have been, or can be, produced. Granting that there is, on the one hand, an almost unbounded power to produce supplies, and, on the other hand, a constant need for them, it should be scientifically possible to adjust bank book-keeping so as to let the prices of goods be the equation between supply and demand, thus leaving the community with sufficient purchasing power to buy what was needed. This solution has been worked out by Major Douglas in a most strict and scientific way, and other people are at work upon the question. The answer will come when the facts are understood. But meanwhile, though the banks could easily lead the way (and there is no need for nationalizing them for the purpose), it is very doubtful how far the great financiers would adopt the new method of their own free will. The late Dr. Walter Leaf of the Westminster Bank said, "Financiers are the universal arbiters of the world's economy"; and such is the lust for power in the human heart, that nothing but some kind of necessity or compulsion will make our real rulers surrender that power. It is not too much to say, taking all these facts into consideration, that we are approaching a crisis which may either upset civilization, or open a way to a wonderful future. Before long there will not be "enough work to go round"! This might be a blessing, if we were prepared for the Leisure

State, but we are not; and meanwhile the question of world-wide unemployment is a problem without a solution on the present basis of machine production *plus* financial monopoly.

(d) STRUGGLE FOR EXPORT MARKETS

In the Report (p. 101) there is a passage which says: "A third possible cause of war lies in economic competition for the control of the raw materials of industry."

This is, of course, true, so far as it goes.

Oil, for instance, is a bone of contention between Britain and the United States. But the worse trouble arises not from the struggle to buy raw material, but the effort to *sell* abroad a surplus of finished commodities, unsaleable at home.

The real danger is, if readers have followed the argument, that there tends to be in every manufacturing nation a surplus which cannot be sold at home through lack of purchasing power, and that foreign markets must be found or forced to make an outlet. This is not the same as a peaceful exchange of a natural surplus, which would, of course, be quite desirable. When it is remembered that this question is closely connected with unemployment its reaction upon world peace is evident. England, Germany, Italy, the United States, Australia and Japan are all faced with the difficulty. A little imagination will make clear that given the continuance of such conditions, the time will come when economic warfare will take other forms.

The implications of all this upon the direct missionary activity of the Church are very serious. A passage in the 1928 Jerusalem Report said: "The social and ethical issues raised by industrial civilization are common to both East and West." It makes the racial difficulties far more complicated and dangerous when economic issues cut across them and spoil the Church's efforts.

It has been thought necessary to lay stress upon the foregoing factors in the situation, as they are not explicitly mentioned either in the Resolutions or the Report at Lambeth. It is not claimed here that the Church should set out as an expert in economics, but it should be demanded that, in urging her people to face the modern world, the actual facts should be known in all their bearings.

Two questions affecting Christian morals come within the social reactions touched upon above: (1) Birth prevention, and (2) peace and war.

(1) The notorious Resolution No. 15 is not dealt with in this reference. But Resolution No. 17 does offer opportunity for remark. That finding runs:

While the Conference admits that economic conditions are a serious factor in the situation, it condemns the propaganda which treats conception-control as a way of meeting those unsatisfactory social and economic conditions which ought to be changed by the influence of Christian public opinion.

This is too vague to have weight with many people whose grasp of the demands of a high standard of morals is uncertain. If the Bishops had said that there is no "scarcity" at all which, on a lower level of morals, could be used as an argument for limiting the family, it would

have been much better. If in addition the Bishops had *attacked* the current financial assumptions in the matter as being contributory to evil moral practices, and had urged people to work for a better social system, they would have won more support for their condemnation. A working man at a Conference on the living wage and the struggle to live on the part of the working classes remarked in the hearing of the present writer: "Give us that living wage you are always talking about, and you will hear much less about birth-control." This remark may not show the highest view of the matter, but it is very relevant. The sad thing here is that, in spite of the good things on these questions which have been said by the Fifth Report and various Lambeth Conferences, scarcely anything has been done to formulate "Christian public opinion," which, therefore, is not invoked with much meaning so far as the ordinary man is concerned.

(2) In the case of Peace and War, the Conference sounds a strong note by saying in Resolution No. 29—

Believing that peace within the nations is bound up with the acceptance of Christian principles in the ordering of social and industrial life . . . the world is still faced with grave social and economic evils which are an offence to the Christian conscience and a menace to peace.

These statements are to the good, but, again, too vague in the way they direct us to work for the application of "Christian principles." They do not get to the root in economics of the real centre of danger—the struggle for Export Markets as the result of, and along with, bad trade and unemployment at home. It may be that the Bishops were slow to allow full weight to the economic element in social conditions, lest they should appear to belittle the influence of ideas and spiritual values in sociology.

It may be well, therefore, to suggest a reconciliation of both of those factors.

As Christians, and giving a fair interpretation to the "Christendom" order of the Middle Ages, we can assert that ideas and the general power of the Faith in those times did in fact help to create a social order which was at heart Christian. Spiritual influence counted for something then.

But since the break-up of medieval Christendom the Church has lost control of social life; there has been a growing divorce between Religion and the secular order. How far religious conditions were responsible for this, and how far the Church was itself the victim of circumstances, is a debatable question; but the fact remains. The development of capitalism, especially in its swift latest phase, has proceeded with very little organized attempt on the Church's part to cleanse, direct and redeem it, and it has now reached a climax in the centralized system of financial monopoly, which is the glaring feature of today.

So it is *at this point* where "Christian principles" must be applied rather than in general and otiose appeals for "goodwill."

Post-medieval ideology is "incarnate" in modern financial economics. Therefore "redemption" must begin there also.

This does not mean that spiritual ideas and values are locked up in bank book-keeping, but it does mean that the opening of the secular door to a better social order which will be capable of showing the way

to the things of the Spirit must accompany all our efforts to re-win and re-state Catholic social conceptions.

When Lord Shaftesbury had great effect in rousing Christian opinion about the slavery of women and children ninety years ago, he knew that his efforts needed to be expressed and enforced by legislation, which is, after all, a "material" thing, in so far as it is technical. Without legislation his spiritual work would have been dissipated. We do not admit the "materialist interpretation of history" by assenting to this. Our Lord did a "material" thing in feeding the five thousand, yet in another sense, as has been well said, that miracle was "a spiritual act."

And so it must be now. It is because we regard spiritual values so much, and believe that only in the Kingdom of God can the best human social order be achieved, that we must be ready to adopt a realist position as well as to inspire men with the Vision of the Kingdom. Or, to put it in another way, the existing order is founded upon a contradiction—namely, the impossibility of reconciling our power to produce and our needs to consume. This is a fact of mathematics, though full of spiritual implications. And, as a Catholic writer on this very matter has said, "you cannot moralize a contradiction." Mathematical fact must be treated as such, without any derogation to spiritual truth.

Yet it would be unfair to ignore any approach to this position which the Bishops have shown, and that they have done so may be gathered from the following quotations from the Report:

"Neither industry nor commerce nor finance lie outside the borders of the Kingdom of God, for, at every point they touch human values and depend on human motives" (p. 24).

"We cannot say that society has even yet come to believe that industry exists for man, not man for industry" (p. 104).

"It is a strange paradox" (p. 105 quoted above).

"Again, the crucial problem of finance is international. Without entering into difficult technical considerations . . . the Church cannot accept the contention that these questions lie outside its province" (p. 101).

PAUL STACY.

III

V. (a).—THE SUPPLY AND TRAINING OF MEN FOR HOLY ORDERS

It was perhaps inevitable that the subject of the supply and training of clergy should be completely overshadowed by other subjects more controversial or more in the forefront of popular attention; but the lack of any sort of reference to it in the secular and even the ecclesiastical Press proves that such is the case.

Yet the interesting table of figures, printed on p. 166 of the Report, cannot but rouse serious misgiving in regard to the future welfare of the Church of England. A great upheaval such as a four years' war was bound to bring with it confusion into every department of public life, and it would not be so gravely disturbing to know that there are now 5,000 fewer clergy ministering in England than was the case in 1914, if only some assurance could be given that the deficiency is steadily, though

slowly, being overtaken. These figures, however, reveal the startling fact that, although the actual number of men being ordained is rising (in 1929 it reached the highest figure since the war, with the exception of 1923, when the numbers were affected by the inrush of service candidates), the losses caused by death and retirement are still year by year some fifty in excess of the recruits.

Figures in themselves are cold things, but when translated into terms of life and action they speak, as the Committee points out, of "overwork for the clergy who are conscientiously attempting the impossible, over-work which not only ruins their health but tends to break their spirit. It means that the flock of Christ is not being fed as He enjoined. It means that aggressive evangelization is retarded both at home and abroad."

All this is truly and well said, but if the unvarying decline in the figures of the total clergy at work in England from 16,466 in 1919 to 15,070 in 1929 is to continue, it would involve within a measurable distance of time the complete breakdown of an organized ministry.

We are left, then, to conclude that the Committee had ground to believe that the tide has turned and there will be a steady and marked increase in the number of ordination candidates in the near future; were it not so, they would surely have dealt more heroically than is the case in their Report with the questions of "voluntary clergy" and the ministry of women. It is not the purpose of this article to analyze the causes which combine to make it difficult for men of the right sort to offer themselves at the present time for ordination; the subject is cautiously but fairly dealt with in Section IV. of the Committee's Report.

If the Committee appear to be unreasonably optimistic in the face of the facts which are suggested by their published figures, it is an optimism which is probably shared by those who are directly concerned in work amongst ordination candidates. For these men have constant experience of the wonderful way in which God "rounds up" his ordinands. Given a Church that will take its ember seasons seriously and pray to the "Lord of the harvest," given a change in the "defeatist" atmosphere which much of the Church talk and writing at the present time tends to create, but which this Lambeth Report, taken as a whole, will do a great deal to disperse, and the whole question resolves itself mainly, as the Committee's Report implies, into one of finance; the men will be forthcoming; many, indeed, would say that they are already forthcoming.

But after all has been said that could be said about supply, it is the quality of the commissioned officers rather than mere numbers on which depends the welfare of a Church. So we are led to the important question of the best training of the clergy, both before and after ordination.

The Committee's Report, it must be admitted, does not speak with the dogmatic assurance of some of its predecessors in three respects: a University degree is not to be required of all, though it is strongly advocated: "The ideal training for most candidates is a degree course in one of our Universities followed by a period of special preparation"; moreover, a knowledge of Greek may be dispensed with, though "only in exceptional cases, particularly in those of older men whose education has been interrupted"; and thirdly, the requirement of two years at a theological college in the case of graduates is modified by the statement, "The course should cover at least one year, though we should much like to see that period somewhat extended."

To the criticism that the Church, as judged by these extracts, appears

to be lowering its standard of requirement, it might be answered that in this, as in other parts of the Report, the Church is merely trying to be honest and to take into account the circumstances of these bewildering times. In point of fact, at no period this century, in spite of episcopal resolutions, has the Church been in a position to insist on a University degree, and least of all during these post-war years when the upper middle classes generally, and the clergy in particular, have often been compelled by financial considerations to send their boys straight from school into business; again, while the admission of any exception to the general necessity of a knowledge of the Greek Testament is bound to come as a shock to the older generations, here again the changes in our general educational system must be reckoned with, and in point of fact the very large proportion of University men who pass from the modern side at school and proceed to read History or Economics or Science for their degree, whether "honour" or "pass," do not know even the Greek alphabet. It may fairly be questioned whether such men can acquire in a couple of years, during which language study must be subordinate to other subjects, sufficient knowledge for them ever to use or appreciate their Testaments in Greek. All the same, the possibility of the rise of any considerable proportion of clergy ignorant of their Greek Testaments is a shocking thing, and we could wish that the Report had insisted in all cases, even of the "older men," that, as some compensation for such exemption, a wider range of knowledge should be required in the form of what the Americans term "elective subjects."

It is satisfactory to note that the Committee recommend that where the degree course admits of it, as is the case at Cambridge, the undergraduate is advised to spend the first part of his time in reading some subject other than Theology, and the latter part in reading that subject. "This plan," comments the Report, "provides a very valuable course of training in the majority of cases."

Some experts, whose opinions rightly carry weight, argue that men intending to proceed to ordination should begin their theological work in the first year and read theology steadily for three years in the University. The experience of the writer of this article is strongly in opposition to such a proposal for any except men of marked character and ability. The Board of Divinity is the servant not of the Church but of the University; its concern is not primarily religion but scholarship, and men taking up theology before they have acquired a religious background to life will learn to criticize before they have learnt to appreciate; they will be so occupied with the minute study of the trees that they will never see the forest in all its grandeur and its beauty. That this is too often the case was borne out by the confidential report of one of the missionaries in a mission to the University held some years ago; in this he expressed his grave concern at the number of those reading theology who had consulted him in deep spiritual distress.

On the other hand, it is indeed of importance that ordination candidates should read theology as soon as they are in a position to gain from such study, and we could wish that all Cambridge ordinands would take some section of the Theological Tripos during their last year or two years, or at Oxford the Honour School or the post-graduate Diploma in Theology. If this were done, it would enormously lighten the work of the staff of a theological college; in cases where a man already knows the Scriptures critically and the history of Christian doctrine, he and his teachers need

spend no time before getting on to the relation of these subjects to the thought of our day and to the question of how best to "get the knowledge across" to the minds and needs of the English people, and this surely should be the chief aim of a theological college on its intellectual side.

In this connection we welcome the Lambeth Resolution in regard to the character of the theological colleges which the Church desires to encourage: "The Church should establish theological colleges in close connection with Universities and should join with the representatives of other Churches in establishing theological faculties in them." The primary reference is to "the promoting of theological study in the newer Universities," but the larger principle behind it is the linking up of what might be termed scientific or academic theology with the more pastoral theology which is the peculiar province of the theological college. The advantages of such association of University and theological college are obvious—for the ordination candidate it secures opportunities of a wider outlook, contact with leaders of thought, and intercourse with men preparing for other professions—whereas the University gains from the presence and influence of men who are able to contribute much to its religious and moral life.

The Committee further express the hope that such additional colleges as the Church shall presently require shall be "established by the Church itself," and "that they should each of them have a body of teachers representing the various schools of thought." The Resolution of the Conference is more hesitating on this point, but we earnestly trust it will be acted upon. There is no greater fallacy in regard to theological colleges than that which supposes it to be necessary for every college to have a party character, as indeed there have been in the past few features more hurtful to the internal unity of our Church. Men of public school tradition at the age of the early twenties are by nature and tradition tolerant, and, provided a college gives opportunity for every man to be himself (which means in regard to devotional life a daily celebration, variety of use, and no compulsory attendance), nothing is more easy than to establish a tradition of liberty and comprehensiveness.

The present writer would differ from the general opinion of those in authority in the theological college department in his approval of the Committee's modification of the rule that graduates must spend two full years at a theological college. The Church does indeed owe to these colleges a debt beyond reckoning for the general rise these last seventy years in the level of the spiritual and devotional life of its clergy, but this must not blind us to the fact that the time spent there by healthy-minded English University men is fraught with danger; it is a hard thing for a man of no marked intellectual ability, but with perhaps obvious pastoral gifts and great keenness to be "up and doing something," to have to spend two whole years in self-culture, alike of spirit and of intellect, without any proportionate opportunity to express himself. Every good college does, of course, take great pains in one way or another, mainly by the cultivation of a strong common life, to minimize the danger, but it should be taken into consideration. "I do dread going out from this place any less keen than I am now," was a remark made to the writer by one of the best of men. It is not difficult to think out an adequate reply: none the less every Principal fears for a loss of keenness. The Committee are surely right; no rule can be laid down to cover all men; there are many who can really use two full years in theological reading

with increasing profit, and these should certainly be encouraged to do so; others, whether they spend eighteen months or six years at their college, will never be theologians, and the best one can do for such men is to insist on a working knowledge of theology and on a frank recognition on their part of how little they know and how much is yet to be known, and then let them give of the fulness of their youth and their enthusiasm in the service of the poor and of the young. The time has gone when a Church can be adequately staffed by mere "English gentlemen in Holy Orders"—but these have their gifts which God has used in the past story of our Church, and yet can use. If there is truth in this point of view, perhaps the more satisfactory plan might be to attempt for ordination examinations something corresponding to the distinction between "honour" and "pass" schools in a University. To do this would probably result in the better distribution of the clergy, apportioning to each the work for which he was particularly fitted; under the present system the scholar is apt to spend some of his best years in work side by side with the athlete who managed to get a third in his pass degree; he probably does the work no more acceptably than the latter, and certainly deteriorates in scholarship because he has so little time for reading.

Mr. Compton Mackenzie has written somewhere: "I am tempted to wonder whether it much matters what a man is taught so long as he meets enough men who have been taught something else." The remark hits us hard. Theological colleges can teach their students something about God, and they can, and do, give invaluable help towards a life of self-discipline and devotion, but the one thing they cannot do is to give them any adequate knowledge of men. This is perhaps one of the most serious defects in our system, and one for which it is hard to discover a remedy. Overseas Bishops as they move about the country this year of Conference have been shocked to discover to what extent the cultured laity of England—men of goodwill who are aware of the spiritual background of all good life and are willing enough to be friendly—appear to be completely out of touch with the younger clergy; and we must admit there is truth in the criticism. It is easy to blame such laymen and the public school system which produces a high ethical product but as regards religion leaves so much to be desired; yet the padre is also at fault—in too many cases he seems to desire to have it so, "crabbing" the Christianity of those who are not of the inner circle of worshippers, and by heightening the walls of division making them feel they are indeed outsiders. There is surely something amiss in our teaching, and in company doubtless with others responsible for that teaching I am left in wonderment; we cannot have a great war each generation for the benefit of the clergy, and the six lines of the Report which touch on the subject are hardly adequate.

In drawing attention to this weakness we do not forget that the priest is called "to stand on the godward side" in relation to other men, and if this is to be done faithfully and effectively, nothing can take the place of continuous and painstaking study of theology in relation to the thought and perplexity of the times in which we minister. In the concluding sentences of this section of their Report the Committee record their "conviction that the training for the ministry does not end with ordination to the diaconate"; we earnestly hope that diocesan Bishops will give their attention to the suggestions there put forward for the encouragement of post-ordination study, for the Church needs today theologians no less than clergy who are "good with children."

B. K. CUNNINGHAM,

REVIEWS

PHILOSOPHICAL THEOLOGY. Vol. II. By F. R. Tennant.
Cambridge University Press. 1930.

An empirical approach to the science of knowledge, ontology, and theology will commend itself to the modern mind as against the old *a priori* method of approach, if only because a scientific age imperatively demands actuality and brute fact in any discussion of the nature of the Real.

The type of empiricism which Dr. Tennant has adopted was clearly indicated in the first volume of his weighty treatise. Not the least of the valuable elements in his work is the consistent application of this method of approach throughout both volumes. To construct a philosophy of the soul, the world and God from conclusions such as may be reasonably reached from universally accepted data and under the constant control of facts and sciences, was the herculean task Dr. Tennant set himself. Readers of volume one were left in some doubt as to whether any sound theistic position could be reached from the sifted data which the learned author left himself after such rigorous criticism. A perusal of volume two will go a long way to remove such doubts. The most important result which emerges from a reading of both volumes is, in the opinion of the present reviewer, the fact that such a philosophy of the soul, the world and God can be constructed side by side with as searching and penetrating a criticism of the popular appeal to the argument from "religious experience" as it would be possible to find in any modern treatment of the subject. Chapter xii. of vol. i. on "Religious Experience" was devastating, and even though it was shown that psychological explanation of religious experience did not necessarily exclude a theistic reinterpretation, no pains were spared to reveal the inherent weakness of the appeal to religious experience as a foundation upon which to reconstruct Christianity in terms of modern thought. The attack upon "the fertile bathos of experience" which comes from psychology renders any such foundation a weak one upon which to build.

A broader foundation is clearly imperative, and Dr. Tennant has done the world of theological thought no mean service in exposing the weakness of what is for the moment a fashion in the many efforts after reconstruction. Having shown that the psychology of religious experience, and the epistemology of religious belief, like the science of the physical world, can be expounded "atheously," and that so long as the *ordo cognoscendi*

is pursued faithfully, exposition *must be* atheous, he goes on to show the possibility of a reinterpretation in the theistic direction. The argument, however, relies on *other data* than those of religious experiences, and on other sciences than the psychology thereof. The argument from an empirical approach is upon a much broader and consequently much sounder foundation than anything possible by reference to Schleiermacher, Ritschl, and their modern adherents, who in the opinion of some of us have been building upon the shifting sands of religious emotionalism. We welcome, therefore, all the more warmly such an effort at reconstruction as Dr. Tennant has given us in which the epistemology of mysticism is tested and its claims refuted and then theism is established by other means than mystical experience.

Within the limits of a brief notice it is quite impossible to do justice to a constructive piece of work such as Dr. Tennant now offers us. To criticize specific points or to canvass positions established in this second volume would necessitate the writing of a treatise, whilst to praise the whole work overmuch would be bordering upon an impertinence. The present reviewer's task is rendered the more difficult inasmuch as Dr. Tennant's final conclusions are in the main exactly in accord with those reached in *Some Postulates of a Christian Philosophy*. Moreover the type of philosophical theology which steers a midway course between a rigid Monism and a thoroughgoing Pluralism is what the seeker after a Christian Philosophy so desperately needs, that when Dr. Tennant generously supplies it, our critical faculties are abandoned in an ecstasy of gratitude. If we are to utter a discordant note in the midst of so much for which we cannot express adequately our thanks, we should say that in our judgment Dr. Tennant is least happy or convincing in his over-emphasis (following Dr. Oman) upon the ethical quality of the Divine immanence in man, his treatment of the Trinitarian problem, and in his handling of Christology. And this last point, indeed, brings us to the parting of the ways, and raises a final question. Can an empirical approach ultimately secure for us the values inherent in Christian dogma? The discarded *a priori* approach did give us a form of Christian Theism in which such distinctive Christian doctrines as those of the Trinity, the Incarnation, and the Atonement found a home. The dogmatic theologian, however, consciously or unconsciously, approaches the problem with a bias in favour of his doctrines, and if he cannot force a philosophical system to conform to their requirements, concludes that the defect lies in the philosophy and not in the Dogmas.

No reader of Dr. Tennant's work can fail to be impressed

by the transparent honesty of his intellectual treatment. Volume one was a quest for a philosophy dictated by experience and facts, *with indifference to theological issues*. That Volume two leaves us with a theistic conclusion is a result, therefore, not of theological bias but of sound and convincing argumentation. He may thus justly claim to have given us a form of Philosophical Theology which can face without fear the assaults of rationalism and the atheistic conclusions of secularism. Whether, however, the distinctive characteristic features of Christianity and specific Christian doctrines can find adequate expression in such a philosophical theology as Dr. Tennant has produced is a question which the publication of these two valuable volumes challenges the theologians to answer.

In the modern quest after religious belief, however, the anxious seeker after truth will find in Dr. Tennant's exposition of Theistic Religion what he justly claims for it, viz., a kind of religious faith which not only may welcome, but actually enjoy, support from the organized body of probable belief which we call knowledge. For the type of mind, therefore, which yearns for a faith intellectually reasonable and capable of standing boldly unconfounded in the daylight and the "disinterestedness" of science and philosophy, Dr. Tennant's pages supply a rich feast. If at the end of the intellectual study they reach the author's conclusion that "the cosmos is no logico-geometrical scheme, but an adventure of divine love," they may be tempted to take an active part as adventurers, and doing so will learn in another school why no scheme of "philosophical theology," however well grounded, is ultimately adequate to supply the hunger of the soul after the Divine. Knowledge about God is not sufficient. Only by conversion can we attain to a unity which transcends an intellectual appreciation of the Object of our quest, and "knows" in ways past telling. For as Augustine says, "I collected myself from the dispersion wherein I turned from Thee, the One, and was vainly divided."

H. MAURICE RELTON.

EPISCOPACY: ANCIENT AND MODERN. Edited by C. Jenkins and K. D. Mackenzie. S.P.C.K. 1930. 12s. 6d. net.

No time could have been more appropriate for the publication of a book on *Episcopacy* than the present, when public attention is concentrated on the pronouncements of the Lambeth Conference. The book is not controversial nor apologetic, but, in the main, descriptive. It consists of twenty-one essays, of which eleven concern the episcopate as it functions in the

churches of the Anglican Communion, and four as it operates in the Roman Catholic, Orthodox, and Old Catholic Churches, and in the Church of Sweden. All the eleven are written by men who are personally associated with the history and the working of the system which they describe; but the four have been entrusted to outside observers. Their essays, however, do not suffer from any want of knowledge or sympathy. Dr. Wigram, who describes episcopacy as it is found among the Orthodox, has an intimate experience of the East extending over half a life-time. Mr. Moss is hardly less intimate with Sweden. The Bishop of Bangor is certainly an outsider to the Roman Catholic Church; but he gives us a narrative so strictly objective and well-informed that no objection could fairly be taken to any statement contained in it. If any of these papers is less objective than the rest, it is Bishop Palmer's account of the episcopate in India. He tends to justifications more than the rest. But his advocacy of the constitution, which he has done so much to shape, perhaps gains in warmth and interest by contrast with other chapters which are more impersonal. Besides these articles descriptive of episcopacy as it is revealed under conditions which now exist, there are others of historical or dogmatic purport. Dr. Lowther Clarke sums up the present position of the long-standing discussions upon the "Origins of Episcopacy," and Dr. Maclean deals, in a historical enquiry, with the "Position of Clergy and Laity in the Early Church in Relation to the Episcopate." Dr. Stone calls our attention to the doctrine of episcopacy in a short but candid exposition of the succession as affecting the problem of "Episcopacy and Reunion."

I cannot find any doubtful statements; and criticism is hardly necessary. But there are two points of importance to be noted.

The first is that this book amply confirms what has often been noted as one of the great merits of episcopacy—namely, its adaptability. Perhaps this is one of the reasons as for its early appearance so also for its universality; for the vitality of an institution—or still more, of an organism (for episcopacy is organic to the Church)—is in proportion to its power of adaptation to changing conditions. In Ireland, we are told, the Anglican bishop's "authority lies ultimately in binding laws so tightly framed that lawyers themselves cannot explain them away." In New Zealand, "Synods and boards . . . tend to reduce the authority of the episcopate to a position akin to that of chairmen of committees." In the Roman Obedience, the system of Quinquennial Faculties, granted to a bishop, and the requirement of a Quinquennial report and

visit to Rome, represent a subjection to the Papacy which Döllinger thought to have destroyed the ancient constitution of the Church; though the Bishop of Bangor is content to say that they are "a useful means to keep the bishops in touch with the Roman Court, and to steady them in the attitude of respectful reverence to their Supreme Head." Under all these conditions, episcopacy can still survive and do its work. It is an "institution," said Dean Church, "which has borne the changes and the rough usage of time; but it has the power of recovery, of preserving and returning to its type." And from this he concluded that: "It is as impossible to imagine it stopping, come what may, as it is impossible to think of Christianity coming to an end."*

The other point of interest seems to follow from the evidence borne by its vicissitudes to its endurance and universality. Such an institution must be more than merely historic. There must be a truth which it embodies; for episcopacy without the Apostolic Succession would be like a body without a soul. By this we mean not merely succession in office. That is part of the idea of succession; and that part of it which is put forward by Irenæus and Tertullian, who used the fact of what was openly taught in common by successive occupants of various sees as a sufficient answer to the Gnostic claim in favour of a private tradition as to truth. But there was more than this in succession. No attention was called at first to a succession by consecration. It was taken for granted. The usual thing was the laying on of hands in ordination by one competent to ordain. This competence may have rested with an individual bishop or for a time, but not ultimately, with a college of bishops; and it meant transmission. Antecedently to the use of Imposition of Hands in ordination, the ceremony had a well-recognized meaning. It cannot be better described than by Dr. Driver, in reference to its use in the Old Testament. "The ceremony," he says, "does seem to symbolize the transmission, or delegation, of a moral character or quality, or of responsibility or authority (or of power to represent another)."† And it is as embodying this principle that the succession is of unique importance. "The most vital of the facts about episcopacy is left out of account if episcopacy is regarded simply as a historical survival, or as a method of government, or as an external device which may promote external unity."‡

B. J. KIDD.

* Sermon on "The Episcopate in History," in *Pascal and other Sermons*, p. 106.

† *Priesthood and Sacrifice* (ed. W. Sanday), p. 39.

‡ Dr. Stone's essay, *Episcopacy*, p. 382.

NOTICES

J. W. C. WARD: A HISTORY OF THE MODERN CHURCH FROM 1500 TO THE PRESENT DAY. Methuen. 8s. 6d.

This book contains an immense number of facts which are not easily to be found elsewhere in one volume. We do not, however, think it entirely suitable for the use of theological colleges, for which it is apparently intended. Students beginning Church History are apt to think it dull. We fear this book will only encourage that idea. The reader without some previous knowledge will not be able to see the wood for the trees: the paths through the jungle of modern Church History are not blazed with sufficient clearness.

As a work of reference, the value of the book is impaired by serious mistakes, some of which are due to over-compression. For instance, on p. 201 the impression is given that the Pope became the "prisoner of the Vatican" in consequence of the campaigns of Garibaldi: Rome was annexed by Italy in 1870, not in 1861. There are more important errors than this. Whatever we may think of Charles I. and Laud, it cannot be denied that, but for their lives and deaths, the Anglican Communion as it is today would not exist. But Mr. Ward, with astonishing ingratitude for an Anglican, sums up Charles as "a really bad king," and does not mention Laud's martyrdom at all! The account of the Russian Church in chapter xix. seems to have been derived from some hostile source. The Church, so far from "persecuting Tolstoy with petty spite," did everything possible to reconcile him to the Faith which he had denied. The events since the Revolution are treated most unsatisfactorily. The author gives no hint that the "progressive priests" who controlled the Sobors of 1923 and 1925 were a particularly disreputable sect of schismatics, who were directly responsible for the martyrdom of the Metropolitan Benjamin, and have never been recognized by any part of the Orthodox Church. Nor does he recognize that a *rapprochement* (p. 228) between the Soviet Government and any religious body is impossible in principle: and he states, contrary to such evidence as there is, that "the greater part of the peasantry absorbed Communist ideas."

His treatment of the Old Catholics, again, is full of mistakes. Jansen died in 1638, not 1628 (p. 114). The immediate cause of the separation of Utrecht from Rome was not the condemnation of Quesnel in 1713, but the unjust and uncanonical deprivation of Archbishop Codde in 1701. "Jansenist" was a hostile nickname, never accepted by the Church of Utrecht. The Old Catholics are not "dwindling in numbers": since 1889 their bishops have increased from five to thirteen. On p. 268 the important recognition of Anglican Orders in 1925, followed by renewed intercourse, should have been mentioned.

Colenso was condemned, not merely for his views on the Old Testament, but for his denial of the Atonement, and because he would not admit that a bishop has any other authority than that derived from the Crown. The statement on p. 145, that "the Turks disdained to recognize differences of creed, but only of nationality," is the exact opposite of the truth. Intercommunion has not been established with the Church of Sweden (p. 270), for Anglicans have not been given permission by their own bishops to communicate at Swedish altars.

The book therefore requires a good many small corrections; but taken as a whole it will be of considerable value, including as it does an immense number of facts which cannot be found elsewhere within the covers of one book. The difficulty of modern Church History is due to the fact that the various sections of Christendom pursue separate courses, which have until very recently exercised very little influence on one another. This book, while laying, as is natural, emphasis on English Church History, deals impartially with Roman, Eastern, and American affairs. A "select list of books" at the end will be found useful.

C. B. Moss.

SO-CALLED REBELS. A Record of Recent Events in the Diocese of Birmingham. By G. D. Rosenthal and F. G. Belton. Mowbrays. 2s. 6d.; cloth, 3s. 6d.

This little book deals irreversible judgment. It is a good thing that the facts of the Birmingham controversies should be set down; it is better that it should be done with the accuracy, fairness and charity which its authors have consistently employed. This is a Christian book about a sore scandal. So far from building up an *ex parte* case, the writers allow the Bishop to speak for himself at almost over-generous length; the other side is put as fully as their own. For the temper of this book, no less than for its clear statement of fact, the Church may be truly grateful.

That does not make the record less, but more tragic. Of this Father-in-God, in a situation created with haste and harshness by himself and surmountable only by mutual knowledge and goodwill, it has fallen to be said: "Of the two writers of this book, one has met the Bishop from time to time officially at meetings of the Cathedral Chapter, but has had only one personal conversation with him, arising out of a matter which had no relation to this controversy; the other has never met him at all." The Bishop, while he shows himself anxious to avoid law-suits "which would do harm to the Church," will communicate with an important group of his priests on the most sensitive controversial issues only through the public Press. He who appeals to the law as his principle of rulership, when an appeal to that law is formally made, will neither acknowledge its competence nor abide by its decisions. This suffering, this destruction of Christian peace, is inflicted for doctrinal reasons which the Archbishop of Canterbury's reproof and the protests of brother Bishops find insupportable, and by "verbal brutalities" which the great secular journals describe as "arrogant," "medieval in fierceness," "deplorable."

Events bring their lessons: this one, many. Those which concern the problems of episcopal authority and the obedience due to the individual bishop are ably summed up in the passage quoted on p. 60 from a monograph of the Rev. Kenneth Mackenzie. But there are deeper lessons behind. The Church of Christ, after all, depends for its character and credentials before men on the elementary virtues of humility and charity. Highest place demands their exhibition in highest measure. Otherwise must come disaster, division, shame.

E. MILNER-WHITE.

RETREATS FOR PRIESTS. According to the method and plan of the Spiritual Exercises of S. Ignatius. By Fr. Longridge, S.S.J.E. Messrs. A. R. Mowbray and Co., Ltd. 10s. 6d.

The appearance of this book will be welcomed by all those interested in the development of retreat work and the sanctification of the priesthood. The companion volume, *Ignatian Retreats for Lay People*, has in the past helped many a conductor of retreats to realize what a retreat should be, as well as being found invaluable for the purpose of administering private retreats to the laity.

The volume under review should be in the hands—not on the book-shelves—of most priests.

The first object of the book is to provide the material for private retreat, either administered by a conductor or without such help. The author in his preface points out the advisability of a longer retreat than usual being made at certain periods of the priest's ministerial life: "I have made the first retreat considerably longer than has been customary among us, because I believe that it will be very profitable for most priests to have a retreat of ten or twelve days two or three times in the course of their ministry." The book provides for retreats of varying length from twelve to three days.

It should also be of help to the busy priest for quiet times. There are some who think they could not get the time for a lengthy retreat, or who, dreading the rigour of a solitary retreat, prefer their usual short conducted one, but who still would find great profit from a prolonged spiritual effort made according to the plan of the Ignatian Exercises spread over a period, by setting aside a few consecutive hours a week, or a day a month, for a definite time for waiting on God.

Experienced retreat conductors will be grateful for Fr. Longridge's clear pronouncement on the relation of instruction and meditation, for undoubtedly conductors as a class err on the side of providing too much instruction. The essential part of the retreat address is that it may be used for meditation. ". . . it is when the meditations are kept free from such instructions that they preserve more completely their proper character of spiritual exercises, in which the retreatant contemplates the Divine Model, and is moved through his affections to acts of the will and to prayer."

GILBERT SHAW.

THE CHURCH AND THE BIBLE. By H. L. Goudge, D.D. Longmans, Green and Co. 1930. Pp. 118. 4s. net. In paper covers, 2s. 6d. net.

Mr. Prestige is doing good service alike to theology and practical religion through his admirable series "The Anglican Library of Faith and Thought," in which the facts of religious experience and history are treated in such a manner as to illustrate the principles involved or implied in them. In the volume before us Dr. Goudge has undertaken the somewhat formidable task of constructing a bridge across the gulf which divides Catholics from Protestants in their view of the Church and the Bible, and Fundamentalists from those who study the Bible by modern critical methods.

This may seem to some a case of attempting the impossible, and it is by no means improbable that the less venturesome spirits on either side will not hazard their convictions on the erection he has devised. But however this may be as regards the more extreme exponents in the

two camps, the vast majority of Englishmen, rightly or wrongly, are by no means adverse to bridges. In fact they love the middle ways, and if we mistake not they will feel very much at home in the general position set forth in this book.

At heart the average man is a "Bible Christian," and, even if he does not practice religion to any appreciable extent, he nevertheless has a very deep-seated regard for the Holy Scriptures. But educated people are unquestionably perplexed by the apparent discrepancies between attitudes adopted in the sacred record and their own world-view. In exalting the Scriptures over ecclesiastical tradition, the Reformers assumed a theory of infallibility which gave the Bible its central place in English life and literature, but left little or no room for the allegorical method of interpretation adopted by the Fathers. Consequently when the advance of scientific investigation in the second half of the last century rendered any notion of verbal inspiration untenable, the Old Testament became a closed book for many who had been brought up on a religion of Bibliolatry. Some relapsed into either obscurantism or unbelief, while the majority remained and still remain simply bewildered.

Dr. Goudge has therefore met a real need in providing a very readable volume in which he shows the true relation between modern knowledge and critical methods and patristic mystical interpretation, obscured by Puritan Fundamentalism. While feeling that the critics are substantially right, he thinks a more complicated key than they provide is required to reveal the real treasures of the sacred ark. After all, as he maintains, it is the mystical significance of the revelation that is of permanent religious value, and this he brings out without doing violence to the historical background. In perusing these pages, devout scholars will derive spiritual enlightenment and inspiration, while the parochial clergy and perplexed laity should find herein the bridge many of them are seeking between the old and new Biblical learning.

E. O. JAMES.

CHRISTIAN DHYĀNA: OR, PRAYER OF LOVING REGARD. A STUDY OF
"THE CLOUD OF UNKNOWING." By Verrier Elwin, of the Christa
Seva Sangha. S.P.C.K. 2s. 6d.

This is a small book but not a little book, and it is hardly too much to say that all those who are called to the Prayer of Loving Regard, as well as all priests who have to direct such souls, would gain much from Fr. Elwin's pages. This is not a book to be skimmed but to be read, pondered and re-read, and it is a handy size for the pocket.

The Cloud of Unknowing is a book of great value to those who desire to advance in the spiritual life, but, even with Fr. Augustine Baker's Commentary, it is difficult of exact comprehension, save to those favoured folk who can grasp the author's meaning by intuition. In this study Fr. Elwin presents us with an admirable exposition of the process of prayer described in the *Cloud*, seizing upon the essential points and explaining them with a lucidity hardly to be found elsewhere, comparing it at all points with the contemplation of the Yogis.

In writing this book our author has two classes of readers in his mind: first, the Hindu who, familiar with the science of prayer to be found in his own religious literature, looks to Christianity to provide a similar but superior Yoga which will fulfil the deepest longing of his heart; and,

secondly, the Christian who may be interested in seeing "the teachings of a great Christian contemplative against the background of Indian thought," and gain thereby a deeper and clearer knowledge of that teaching.

Fr. Elwin begins by giving some account of the thought of the author of the *Cloud* and his forerunners, and then passes on to explain the method of prayer, which he advocates, and how it should be practised. These chapters are the core of the book and of great value, whether one is interested in Yoga or not, owing to their clarity and wisdom. They are followed by a chapter on Yoga and one on Quietism, and anyone who wishes to understand the real danger of the latter and to discover the difference between it and true contemplation, will find what he needs in this chapter.

Fr. Elwin is no friend to that syncretism which believes all forms of mysticism to be essentially the same. He shows the likeness between Christian contemplation and Yoga, but also their differences, explaining also their difference in object and where Yoga falls short. One is glad, too, to note his teaching on the place of asceticism in the life of prayer, and the necessity of the one to the other. Particularly welcome is his emphasis upon the essential *activity* of contemplative prayer. This subject is little understood amongst us, and one seldom comes across any clear teaching about it, with the result that many fervent souls lapse into Quietism for want of knowing anything else.

This is, as we have said, a small book. It is much to be desired that Fr. Elwin may find time one of these days to give us a large book which may develop at full length the teaching of this wise and brilliant summary.

F. P. HARTON.

FROM DANIEL TO ST. JOHN THE DIVINE. By W. J. Ferrar, M.A. With a Preface by W. O. E. Oesterley, D.D. Pp. 121. S.P.C.K. 3s. 6d.

Any volume which will help the student of the New Testament to understand the background of the thought of its age is welcome, and we are realizing more and more how large an area of that background was occupied by eschatology. Mr. Ferrar has printed four lectures on the subject, delivered at Cambridge during the Vacation Term for Biblical Study in 1928.

In his Preface Dr. Oesterley speaks in appreciative language of the author's knowledge of the subject, of the balance of his treatment, of his sane judgment, and of his clear presentation. This opinion is fully borne out by the book itself. In the space at his disposal Mr. Ferrar could offer no more than an outline, and he has given us a real outline, not a volume in which some parts receive elaborate treatment at the expense of the rest. The main features of the apocalyptic movement are fairly noted and set in due perspective, so that the careful reader is in a good position for further and more detailed study. Mr. Ferrar, as Dr. Oesterley notes, rarely ventures on an original opinion, and it goes without saying that he has relied much and wisely on his predecessors, particularly Dr. Charles.

Today pre-Christian and early Christian eschatology are receiving more attention than ever before, and for an introduction to the subject no better book than this has yet appeared.

T. H. ROBINSON.

FORESHEWINGS OF CHRIST. By A. D. Martin. Pp. 192. S.P.C.K. 5s.

In the familiar eleventh chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews, we have a list of the heroes of faith, Old Testament characters whose life and faith helped to prepare the way for the Gospel. Mr. Martin has set before himself an object not unlike that of the New Testament writer. He selects ten people from the Old Testament, and uses what is recorded of them to draw parallels illustrating eternal truths which find their fulfilment only in Christ, and crowns the whole with a chapter on Jesus Himself. The choice of subjects is interesting and suggestive, for Mr. Martin avoids the more familiar personalities and selects those who are less known—at all events to a public nurtured on modern journalism. Thus we have no sections on Abraham, Joseph, Moses, Samuel (indeed it is rather the sinister aspect of Samuel's activities to which attention is called), Isaiah or Daniel. Hosea, Josiah, Jeremiah, and Job are included, it is true, but the rest would commonly be classed among the "minor" Old Testament characters.

The book is essentially homiletic rather than educational, and it would not be fair to demand exact or up-to-date scholarship. Yet Mr. Martin can use his Hebrew Bible profitably (*O si sic omnes!*), and knows with some thoroughness the pre-war literature on the Old Testament, while he is acquainted with some interesting (though not always important) lines of post-war discussion and research. And he brings to his task exactly those qualities required for his purpose—keen sympathy, strong imagination, and strict honesty. He has sometimes set himself an awkward problem, but does not shrink from the solution which truthfulness dictates, and it is not the least helpful element in his work that he can discern spiritual value in spiritual failure. In a word, this is a most useful book for preachers by a preacher.

T. H. ROBINSON.

THE FREE CHURCH SACRAMENT AND CATHOLIC IDEALS: A PLEA FOR REUNION. By T. W. Coleman. Dent. 2s. 6d. net.

The substance of the teaching upon Holy Communion given in this book might well have been given within the Church of England, while the manner in which it is given makes it a valuable handbook for all who are wanting to teach the meaning and appeal of the Sacrament. The writer, who is a Wesleyan Minister and, as he tells us, "a convinced Protestant" (p. 89), admits "that the kind of service advocated would not commend itself to everybody in our churches. A good many laymen, and possibly not a few ministers would oppose it" (p. 85). Nevertheless, he is not alone amongst Free Churchmen in wishing to see the service of Holy Communion enriched by the inclusion of much that belongs to the Catholic Mass. This he firmly believes can be done without any surrender of the Evangelical faith and experience for which the Free Churches have always stood; and in evidence of this claim he cites "the Communion Office in the Anglican Prayer Book" (p. 75). That such a service will prove acceptable to an increasing number of Free Churchmen is not unlikely, he thinks, since there is discernible a tendency to pass beyond Receptionism and to accept Virtualism as the true doctrine of the Divine Presence in the Sacrament (p. 79).

The understanding and appreciation of sacramental doctrine shown

in this book will not only help to pave the way for Reunion amongst Free Churchmen; it will also lead Anglicans to a better-reasoned and more convincing advocacy of the value of Holy Communion.

CYRIL H. VALENTINE.

DOVER PRIORY: A HISTORY OF THE PRIORY OF ST. MARY THE VIRGIN AND ST. MARTIN OF THE NEW WORK. By Charles Reginald Haines. With a Foreword by G. G. Coulton. Cambridge University Press. 30s. net.

Dr. Coulton, in the Foreword he writes for what he justly calls "this valuable book," invites the reader to follow out for himself "the many facts of historical and social interest which he will find in the volume." And, indeed, the book is full of such.

The story begins as early as the times of Diocletian, since it is quite possible that the first church of St. Mary in Dover Castle was built in his day for that portion of the garrison who were Christians. Some three hundred years later, about 619, the Kentish king, Eadbald, instituted in this old church a community of secular canons. In or about 696 King Wihtred built St. Martin's Church in the town, and transferred to it the canons from the Castle. Here they remained for some four hundred years. In *Domesday* the names of the canons and their twenty-two prebends are enumerated.

In 1130, by reason of grave irregularities at St. Martin's, King Henry I. granted it to Archbishop Corbeil and the Church of Canterbury, with the provision that, instead of the secular canons, there should be canons regular of the Order of St. Augustine. The archbishop, to prevent any recurrence of misbehaviour, built in the town another church, which was called St. Martin's of the New Work. Corbeil's successor, Archbishop Theodore, established in the New Work Benedictine monks from his own Canterbury convent, to which he evidently intended the Priory of St. Martin's to be a mere cell, as indeed it practically did become. There were, however, for more than two hundred years, continual disputes between the two priories, until in 1356 St. Martin's was completely crippled, and for nearly two hundred years more dragged along as a mere appanage of Christ Church, Canterbury.

Dr. Haines gives a detailed story of the forty-one Priors who ruled the Priory between its foundation in 1136 and its surrender in 1535. He gives also, in nearly one hundred pages, a vivid picture of life in the Priory. There is a valuable account of the Library, regulations for the Leper Hospital attached to the Priory, and a detailed account of the income and disbursements of 1530, which, as Dr. Coulton suggests, might profitably be compared with the daily expenses at Winchester Cathedral Priory, published by Dean Kitchin.

The site of St. Martin's is now a farm, though extensive ruins remain, the refectory being used as a barn. It only remains to say that in this book the student of monastic life will find much that is helpful and suggestive, and the general reader much of historical and social interest.

A. T. BANNISTER.